Volume VIII Number 1

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1931

ISSUED BY THE

Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary

SPENSER B. MEESER, *Managing Editor*
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, *Business Manager*

CONTENTS

PAGE

THE HIGHER SACRAMENTARIANISM. Gaius Glenn Atkins 5

IS CHRISTIANITY ESSENTIALLY IRRATIONAL? Douglas Clyde Macintosh 16

WHAT IS THE GOOD OF SHAKESPEARE TO US PREACHERS? Charles Luther Williams 30

THE CHRISTIAN'S USE OF THE BIBLE. Stewart G. Cole 36

SOME FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. Morton S. Enslin 47

INDIA'S DILEMMAS. A. S. Woodburne 68

THE POETRY OF THE GOSPELS. Robert E. Keighton 78

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE 92

EDITOR'S NOTES. Spenser B. Meeser 94

BOOK REVIEWS 102

BOOKS RECEIVED 141

Printed for CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY *by*
THE JUDSON PRESS, PHILADELPHIA

Price, 40 cents. Annual Subscription, $1.50, post free

330340

Helpful Books of Sermons

God in Everything

By Frank M. Goodchild, D. D.

A group of twelve nature sermons which the author has tried and proved of worth in the course of his ministry and which are therefore reproduced for a wider and more permanent use. Commonplace things from the familar spectacle of the heavens to the sheep of the pastures and the salt on the dinner-table are laid under tribute for spiritual and religious values. In reading from the book of nature the author has presented the interpretations given in the Bible.

Cloth, $1.50 net

Eternal Contrasts

A Series of Original Discourses

By Alfred Handley Chipman Morse

Sixteen pulpit addresses on themes of abiding interest, from the realities of outer experience to the structures of faith and hope on which the inner life is reared. Contrasts, as Doctor Morse notes, make the joy of life, as also its tragedy; the art of good living is in adjustment of self so as to maintain one's courage.

Cloth, $1.50 net

Sunset Sermons

By William Young Fullerton, D. D.

A group of twenty sermons by this distinguished English preacher, evangelist, and missionary secretary. Pastoral in character, having to do with the development and the deepening of the spiritual life, they are plainly platform addresses, showing the marks of actual encounter with the needs of the groups to which they were delivered. The wealth of expository and illustrative material should make them of large value.

Cloth, $1.75 net

What We Preach

Sermons by Representative Men in the Baptist Ministry

Here are sermons from twenty men, occupants of prominent positions in Christian service, representing a large portion of the United States. The themes are varied, showing a wide range of mental interest. Practical purpose is evident throughout. A wealth of sermonic material is afforded, together with a fine opportunity to study the methods of pulpit workers at grips with matters of immediate mental and spiritual concern in the congregations of America.

Cloth, $1.50 net

The Hurry Call of Jesus

By Thomas J. Villers

Fifteen addresses from the pulpit of the White Temple, Portland, Oregon, alive with evangelistic appeal. They range in theme from that of the one occupying the title role to Christ's Call to Youth, Christ and the Crowd, Your Divine Credit, and addresses delivered on great occasions during the Christian year.

Cloth, $1.50 net

Christ Is All

And Other Sermons

By James Allan Francis, D. D., LL. D.

A volume of short, effective sermons, some occasional—Easter, Thanksgiving—all of them practical rather than doctrinal or expository in spirit, varied in theme, ranging from the sermon in the title role to a little group of addresses on the Holy Spirit, they are all tied together with the thread of evangelistic purpose always dominant with the author.

Cloth, $1.25 net

THE AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

1701-1703 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia

16 Ashburton Place, Boston
2328 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago
313 W. Third Street, Los Angeles
1107 McGee Street, Kansas City
439 Burke Building, Seattle
223 Church Street, Toronto

ORDER FROM OUR NEAREST HOUSE

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY is issued by the Faculty of the Crozer Theological Seminary with the aid of funds provided by the Trustees at the annual meeting in May, 1923.

The scope of THE QUARTERLY embraces all the departments of instruction in the Seminary. Each professor is responsible only for the contributed material and for book-reviews signed by him, but he may publish such articles contributed by others as may be appropriate to his department, without however incurring responsibility for opinions expressed therein.

The aim of THE QUARTERLY is to familiarize the reader with results of investigation in Biblical and historical and theological subjects pertinent to a curriculum in a theological seminary, and also to be a medium by which pastors busily engaged in the ordinary work of a pastorate, may communicate to fellow pastors the results of reading and experience and reflection on subjects on which they are specially qualified to write. From time to time THE QUARTERLY will present surveys of recent literature in various fields of theological learning.

Remittances should be addressed to

THE CROZER QUARTERLY
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CHESTER, PA.

Send other communications and all contributions to

THE MANAGING EDITOR

FACULTY

MILTON G. EVANS, President
Mrs. John P. Crozer Professor of the History of Religion

ISAAC G. MATTHEWS
Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis

FRANK G. LEWIS
Librarian

MORTON S. ENSLIN
Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis

STEWART G. COLE
Professor of Religious Education

REUBEN E. E. HARKNESS
Professor of Church History

WILLIAM R. McNUTT
Professor of Practical Theology

ANGUS STEWART WOODBURNE
Professor of Systematic Theology

GEORGE F. FINNIE
Acting Professor of Homiletics

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER
Director, Extension Course

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, January, 1931, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

Vol. VIII JANUARY, 1931 No. 1

THE HIGHER SACRAMENTARIANISM

GAIUS GLENN ATKINS

Auburn, New York, Theological Seminary

THE interest in Sacramentarianism just now so much in evidence in the English-speaking world may be fairly dated from the Oxford Movement. That marked the beginning, at least, of what might be called the " self-conscious " and controversial phase of it. Christianity had its sacraments from the first, and they had been subject to such changes and accretions as all things are subject to, being also, in part, the continuation of something very much older than Christianity. The Catholic Church believed her own sacraments necessary to salvation, possessing an effectual power therefor when administered by the properly empowered and received in faith. And she had added to the first two such others as seemed needed to invest life at its high points with a mystic binding to the Unseen and Eternal.

All this was a matter of course; the priest administered the sacraments and the faithful received them as an inevitable aspect of the conduct of life, no more to be argued with or about than birth and death and, if there had ever been a time when it was not a matter of course the priest and the communicant had both forgotten it. The Reformers were united

in their opposition to the Mass and divided among themselves about what to put in its place. Newman, in *Tract 38,* quotes John Calvin as maintaining the Real Presence:

> I assert that the Body of Christ is really (as the usual expression is), that is truly given to us in the Sacraments, to be the saving food of our souls. . . The *Son of God* offers daily to us in the Holy Sacrament, the same body which He once offered in sacrifice to His Father, that it may be our spiritual food.

I have not verified this quotation; Newman's quotations are accurate. But this did not make the Calvinistic Churches sacramentarian.

Certainly the Anglican Church which Newman was calling to a "Second Reformation" was not then strongly sacramentarian. The emphasis of the Oxford group upon baptismal regeneration and the need of a more frequent and reverent observance of Holy Communion would prove that. Nor was the Oxford Movement itself sacramentarian to the degree that Anglo-Catholicism now is. *Tract 26* urges "the necessity and advantage of frequent Communion," using arguments with which, for the most part, all Evangelical Churches would agree. *Tracts 27* and *28* examine the history of the doctrine of Transubstantiation and oppose to it the "Catholic doctrine of the Holy Scripture, the ancient Fathers and the Reformed Churches." These Tracts were written by Bishop Cosin, they are still very much worth reading, but they have no excessive sacramentarian trend.

Nevertheless the Oxford Movement in this as in other regions released forces which have carried far beyond the mind or anticipation of the movers; Bishop Cosin, or even Newman himself in that phase of his progress, would certainly have been surprised, and possibly shocked, if they had known that their successors in the same general line would set the Anglican Church at odds about the Reservation of the Sacrament. But the root of the matter was in what they started—the assumption of a supernaturally empowered

priesthood deriving its mystic authority through an apostolically authenticated ordination and competent to give the elements a true sacramental and saving power, which could not be otherwise secured. Result: such an authority is held by the High Church party to be one of the "notes" of the true Church, and sacraments not thus instituted and celebrated are no sacraments at all. A division has thus been created amongst Christians which runs through what ought to unite them, has made the Table of the Lord a subject for unseemly controversy and unbrotherly behavior, furnished headlines for the newspapers and a sorrow to Christianity.

I

It is worth going behind all this to see what the Oxford group were after and what the Roman Catholic Church had been after, and what the Sacramentarian today is after. The Oxford group were certainly trying to steady and revitalize religion in a period when the inherited forms and ways of it in the Anglican Church—for they were concerned with Anglicanism only—were inadequate to the emerging challenge of a complex of forces with which today religion is engaged on every front. After a long and really pretty searching study of the literature of the Movement, I, for one, credit its leaders with a sensitive and sagacious anticipation of what was then for the most part below the horizon.

Many of us cannot agree with the line they took, but no one of us can deny the strategic astuteness of it. They must be understood in the light of their inheritance and temper, but their temper was representative of what has been the largest element in historic Christianity. Religion, for them, could not become real save in authorities, forms, and liturgies. It must lay hold of life concretely and be furnished with an assuring garmenture. It must live in the emotions as well as the reason, in worship as well—and more than—preaching, its focus (bright place) must be the altar rather than the pulpit, it

demanded above all some incarnation in a mystic—I wish one had some other word than that overworked word—transaction with material elements in which the assurance of saving grace given and received became supremely real.

They built a shelter for their souls out of such elements as these and supported the arches beneath which they worshiped with flying buttresses of apostolic succession, episcopal ordination, and peculiar priestly power. Incidentally, having so built and supported their own cathedral, they refused to share it with any layman who was not brought into their company through proper confirmation or any clergyman who was not properly ordained—and I have no quarrel with that as long as one does not call it essential Christianity and does recognize it as a "complex" through which religion becomes real to certain temperaments.

The Roman Catholic Church, with a far more massive historic continuity, had sought the same thing in her own sacraments. A good deal of our trouble in this whole region is due to the fact that a Latin word with a hard legal connotation got substituted for a Greek word hospitable to imagination and opening on every side on far horizons. If we were concerned now with "mysterions" which belong to insight and suggestion and even imagination, instead of sacraments which seem to belong to authority and administration, I doubt if we should have a Sacramentarian controversy. Who can argue about a mystery—at least conclusively? But that is an aside. The development of Roman Catholic practise and theory issued in sacraments, some of them peculiar to the clergy, others shared by the laity. These laid hold of life at its high points, birth, confirmation, marriage, spiritual travail, and death, investing the supreme experiences with an otherworldly character, relating them to unseen and eternal realities, making them spiritual rather than sense-grasped—one gropes for words here—realities, supported with reverences and adorations, issuing in destiny—in a word, sacred.

There is no denying the force of all this. If marriage is a sacrament the literalist may find it hard enough to say what is meant, but marriage is changed for all that. Its bonds become strong enough to withstand fret and friction, misunderstanding, capricious impulse, and all the things which now tend to dissolve marriage, and make it instead an aspect of the life of the spirit, divinely validated. One may recognize clearly enough the difficulties which the sacramentarian conception of marriage involves—but now that it is breaking down, we seem to have nothing to take its place unless we can get the conception back in a more vital and less ecclesiastical form.

The Sacramentarian is still seeking the same thing Newman and his associates sought and the Roman Church secured. He is making religion real in worship, he is tying up its benefits with authority, he is using symbols as aids to faith, he is practising the presence of God in spiritual attitudes which depend for their support upon material things as simple as water and bread and wine, and which have become for him through the transmuting power of his faith and devotion a communion with Jesus Christ beyond the power of reason to dissolve or doubt darken. As long as he confines himself to the testimony of his own experience his position is secure. When he makes his position a divisive test of all Christian experience, he is wrong; when he supports it by pride and makes a barrier of it to Christian unity, he is still more wrong. And we are, all of us—Sacramentarian and Evangelical—limited in vision if we do not see that here is a truth and a power capable of an unspeakably wider application and demonstration.

II

Is it not possible that Sacramentarianism, if only it be made right enough and great enough, is a key to turn the lock of many of our difficulties, a right road of victorious escape from situations which, if they be controlled by no higher sanc-

tion, have in them a fatal power of self-destruction? The Sacramentarian today is seeking the persuasion of spiritual reality behind the veil of sense-seized things. God, the Incarnation, and Atonement, and Salvation, thus become real to him with a power no one can understand who has not his faith and his temperament. He is too ecclesiastical? Very well, but there is something vaster behind it: that in a real sense the material may become the vehicle of the spiritual, that it is not properly dealt with unless it is approached as the vehicle of the spirit, that *all* proper dealing with material things and experiences inevitably demands a sacramental approach.

The word "all," of course, has been slipped in. Church Sacramentarianism uses only the consecrated elements, but suppose all elements were consecrated and all dealing with material things partook in due measure of some sacramental quality.

This brings us at last in sight of what the Editor of this publication asked for—some application of the suggestion of the sacramental to the whole field of life. We do that in other aspects of religion, we take the sanctions of faith and duty and make the whole of life a field for their exercise. In fact, they lose their power unless the whole of life does become a field for their exercise. The great Christian graces are nurtured under the shelter and at the altar of the Christian Church—but they cannot be kept there. Christianity has no more commanding word than love—and no word which may be more easily become a discarnate sentimentality, a vague emotion unrelated to what demands it most, unless every relationship of life and most of all those relationships which try love most and seem farthest removed from its serene devotional expression, are subdued to its exercise. Love is never real until it is concretely real, dominating every relationship from the intimacies of the home to the massed contacts of races and nations.

Why then should not the immensely potential attitudes and insights, whose flame is kindled at the sacramental altar be carried into every region of life and what is as old as the first human gesture toward the Unseen, having since taken countless fugitive and changing forms but never undone, be reinstated upon its throne of control? For in a vague but actual sense the whole primitive way of dealing with nature had in it some sacramental quality. Trees and animals and objects were sacred—not to be dealt with in careless, secular fashion, but as a manifestation of a "Power" which stirred and moved and shone now here, now there, throughout the entire world of a humanity whose world was so small. The result was an actual spiritual concern—a reverent approach to all material things. Seedtime and harvest were hallowed—did not the farmer work with the spirits of the field? Trees were sacred and not to be wantonly felled—was there not a spirit in the tree? Animal life had its own sanctity which, quite as much as any prudential consideration, saved it from purposeless killing and created a brotherhood even between the hunter and the hunted.

Now that we have lost this, something is gone which kept our humanity from wasteful or even cruel high-handed ways with Mother Earth and all her children. Nature is now the revelation of a vaster spirit, but it is still rich in the suggestion of something "still more deeply interfused." It has altars of stellar constellations alight with timeless serenity, hearthstone of the infinite and eternal. It has mountaintop altars kindled from dawns and sunsets to the glory of God. It has the sea for a vestment and liturgies of winds and processionals of changing seasons. We have always had two roads to God, through ourselves and the outer world, and two roads only. The prophets knew this, and the poets have always known it. Listen to Alfred Noyes, the present poet laureate:

With the stars and the clouds I have clothed myself here for your eyes
To behold That which Is, I have set forth the strength of the skies
As one draweth a picture before you to make your hearts wise;
That the infinite souls I have fashioned may know as I know,

. . . . . .

Flashing forth as a flame,
The unnameable Name,
The ineffable Word
I am the Lord.

Here is a revelation to supply for the sensitive soul the very elements which the devout find on lesser altars hallowed by historic faith. We acknowledge them in our more reverent and clairvoyant tempers and take from the Table of the Lord itself the only words which completely express our experience—

Oh, sacrament of summer days,
Oh, last communion in the haze,
Permit a child to join,

Thy sacred emblems to partake,
Thy consecrated bread to break,
Taste thine immortal wine!

It is not only thus that souls are fed, but there is shaped, in consequence, an attitude—I do not know what else to call it—which gives a new quality to all our dealings with the world of nature. If the sacramental feeling for nature could be recaptured we should not so waste our natural wealth or wound the earth with our haste and our greed. This is far more than a specious sentiment; it is a force for conservation and that saving passion for beauty which is as needful as bread.

There has always been in England a sense of dealing with the land as something sacred because it is England, which the poets have fostered, art reflected, and literature grown out of. Every memory and every monument to the far-flung heroic dead have made it deep and rich. The immemorial

beauty of an English landscape, the love of Englishmen for their land, the careful culture of the English soil are the creation of a spirit which has for fifty generations made English soil no

> . . . common earth
> Water or wood or air

but memory and beauty, pride and the bread of the spirit.

III

Industry is entirely a transaction with things and human thought and toil. If even things are sacred, how much more labor? We do make business sacred but too often in a wrong sense. We substitute Prosperity for God in our doxologies and sing

> Praise Prosperity from which all blessings flow
> Praise that all Creatures here below—

The true concerns of humanity are subordinated to the impersonal demands of high-geared business and its interests defended with the same intolerance with which the interests of religion used to be defended. Business has another sanctity than this, it is a vehicle—and one of the greatest—for the realization of spiritual values and the expressions of spiritual forces. I do not believe that the excessive materialization of contemporaneous industry can be corrected by anything less searching and less sovereign than the recognition of just this. So many of our approaches touch only the outside of our economic system, there is no way really to reach and change it save through a changed conception of its significance.

It is not irreverent to conceive business and industry as sacramental. If a sacrament is the outer and manifest sign of an inner and spiritual grace—well, is there any aspect of our human enterprise which is more in need of inner and spiritual grace? And now and then one sees in some unusually idealistic and humane conduct of business a gleam of such

high excellence and an anticipation of so perfect a relationship as to persuade us that if only business can be thus consecrated it may become the incarnation of the Way, the Truth, and the Life of Jesus—and what is that but the Real Presence?

The lines of demarcation between the sacred and the profane (outside the shrine) have been too straitly drawn. If the most significant and vital aspects of the human enterprise are to be left "outside the shrine" what can we hope for save to see them crassly materialized, reducing in return to their own mechanized levels the personalities of those who instead of mastering them are mastered by them, until the only difference between the man and the machine is that the man suffers and despairs.

I have suggested two points in life at which the sacramental conception would work an entire transformation: our dealing with the world without which is ready, if we will let it, to feed our spirits with the timeless bread of beauty and fill for us a cup of suggestion revealing some aspect of the spirit of God whose time-vesture nature us, and our dealing with other personalities and with forces and things in our economic life, but there is actually no limit to the extension of this principle. The soul should have sacramental dealings with the body. Sense—any sense—is not an alien in the spiritual order unless we make it so. It is only when we use the senses with no consecration of them to ends beyond themselves, no subordination to the highest values of life, that sense becomes sensuality.

All our human relations are capable of such a sanctification—even the menacing, massed relations of competitive nations. It is a strange use of the Sacrament to administer it on the battle-field and turn from the memorial of a love which took all the wounding of hate and haste to itself and inflicted no wound in return, to the bitter business of fighting. In the more imponderable regions of beauty, art, music, literature,

and the liturgy of lovely lives and noble deeds this suggestion of the sacramental becomes so vivid as to need only to be named. The great reverences and the great adorations are thus summoned from the shadows from which they are always waiting to be called, and we become by right and for a little citizens of the true homelands of our spirits through communion with its realities thus made manifest. Why then should the awe, the power, the wealth of sacramental experience be so narrowly limited? Spirit without form is the loneliest thing in the world, form without spirit is the emptiest thing in the world. Why should the whole of the material side of life go unsanctified when consecration can work such wonders with bread and wine?

What is begun at the altar should not end there. What the church has received and developed in its own sacraments should become "a source from which influences go out to teach sense-entangled men to consecrate the whole of life on a vaster altar and offer it, broken in its own turn through sacrificial love, as a Real Presence of the Divine."

IS CHRISTIANITY ESSENTIALLY IRRATIONAL?

DOUGLAS CLYDE MACINTOSH
Yale University

It is commonly supposed, even by theological liberals, that the doctrine of the atonement current in conservative or fundamentalist circles is practically the same as that taught by the apostle Paul. It would be difficult to prove this. In fact, if we begin with the study of certain key-passages to the understanding of Paul's thought, we shall be led, I think, to a very different conclusion. The key-passages which I have chiefly in mind are these:

> God . . . reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation. We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God (2 Cor. 5: 18-20).
>
> By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for through the law cometh the knowledge of sin. But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth in his blood, a propitiatory offering, through faith, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; . . that he might be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus (Rom. 3:20-26).

Well do I remember an experience of my own in connection with the first of these passages. Before going to college I had taken charge of a small mission church in a little mining-town, and on one occasion I chose as the text of my sermon for the next Sunday the words, " God was in Christ, reconciling

the world unto himself." The meaning of the passage seemed very clear: God had revealed himself in and through Christ as a God of grace, seeking to win estranged and sinful men to repentance and faith, and thus into reconciliation with himself. But before finishing up the sermon it occurred to me that I had better consult Doctor Strong's *Systematic Theology*. When I turned to my favorite theological authority, however, I was dismayed to find that apparently I had misinterpreted the teaching of the great apostle. The " reconciliation " which was so central a feature of Paul's gospel was the removing of enmity from the offended party, the removing of God's wrath toward man through the death of Christ, which, as a propitiatory sacrifice, had its first and main effect upon God, not upon man. I was not convinced, yet my respect for Doctor Strong was great, and so I did not preach from that text for about a year. Then, however, feeling sure that I was being true to the Christian view of God and of reconciliation, I went ahead, Strong or no Strong, and preached the sermon very much as I had originally prepared it a year before. It was a satisfaction to me a few years later, when a student in college, to hear Dr. George Cross preach from the same text, interpreting it in essentially the same way as I had done.

It seems to me still that this was being true to the deeper insight of Paul with reference to the gracious, self-revelatory work of God in and through Christ for the reconciliation of the world unto himself. There is, it is true, the concept of propitiation to be taken into account, a concept which leads us back into Old Testament modes of thought; but let us try to see just what Paul meant when he made use of this traditional idea of a propitiatory offering. In making the attempt let us first refer briefly to the earlier history of the meaning of sacrifice.

In the very early stages of its history, the sacrificial offering seems to have been, as Robertson Smith long ago pointed out, simply the setting apart of a portion of the communal feast

for the unseen guest, the spirit or God with whom relations were no doubt regarded as being already more or less friendly. It was only a natural development, however, when men with pressing needs and desires began to expect something in return for the food and drink which they had given the God, often at considerable cost to themselves. Crude and primitive as this notion was, there was nothing immoral about it; the idea was simply that of a strictly honorable commercial transaction between the human individual or group and an unseen friendly being, whose existence was commonly taken for granted. But it presupposed a situation and relationship which might easily lead, and often did lead, to an immoral attempt to bribe the God who had come to be thought of as the unseen Judge of the ways and deeds of men. If a man had wronged his fellow man and thus was conscious of having violated the law of a just God, he might conceive the idea of propitiating the offended deity, not by righting the original wrong, but by the less costly method of bringing a gift to the unseen Judge and Avenger. It was against the immorality and, because of the involved insult to a righteous deity, the impiety of such designs and acts that Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah uttered their prophetic denunciations.

But another and more ethical interpretation was no doubt sometimes, perhaps often, put upon the sacrificial offering. The gift was brought to God, not as a substitute for repentance and restitution, but rather as a token and expression of repentance and the desire for reconciliation, at-onement, with a justly offended Deity. It was as if a child who had disobeyed his parent and had later come to be penitent should express his penitence not in words but by bringing a gift to signify his change of heart and desire for forgiveness and reconciliation. No wise parent would fail to understand and appreciate such an approach; the symbolic penitential action would speak louder than mere words, and the child would go away with the peace of conscious forgiveness in his heart. Similarly, many

a time, no doubt, the repentant sinner left the precincts of the temple, after having sacrificed, happy in the assurance of God's forgiveness. In so far as this confidence was objectively justified, it was, of course, because of a sincere repentance, such as would find expression in restitution, as well as because of the righteousness and graciousness of God. But in such an interpretation of the sacrificial act we have the Old Testament idea of sacrifice at its best. Man, the offender, takes, as he ought to take, the first step to propitiate God, whom he has offended; he brings his offering not as a substitute for but as a sign of repentance. It is an idea which is virtually endorsed by Jesus himself, when he says, " First be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift," and the word of Jesus cannot be regarded as irrelevant to this matter.

Paul makes use of the concept of sacrifice, and of propitiatory sacrifice at that, in interpreting his gospel of reconciliation and the significance of the death of Christ. " God hath set him forth in his blood, as a propitiatory offering." " God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." " God was *in Christ,* reconciling the world unto himself." There is one very important difference between this New Testament conception and the Old Testament idea, even at its best. In the Old Testament it is man, the offender, who is expected to take the first step toward reconciliation, bringing his sacrificial offering as a token of his sincere repentance and prayer for pardon. In the teaching of Paul, on the other hand—and here we have a distinctive feature of the New Testament gospel—it is God, the offended one, who graciously takes the first step toward bringing about reconciliation between rebellious man and himself. The sacrificial offering which, it was always supposed, had something to do with propitiating God, is, by a strange paradox, provided by God himself, thus showing that God is in fact propitious already, and waiting to be gracious. He is propitious enough graciously to forgive the sincerely repentant sinner. His propitiousness is not the

effect of the self-sacrificing act of Christ, but—since " God was in Christ"—its cause.

Of course the thought of Paul at this point is not wholly self-consistent. The trouble is not that the Old Testament idea was not fulfilled in the self-giving and death of Christ, but rather that it was more than fulfilled. The Old Testament idea of sacrifice, with man taking the first step to bring about reconciliation with God, could not do justice to the new and essentially Christian idea of God as revealed in the loving, self-giving Christ as the no doubt moral but at the same time propitious God for whom Paul, as an ambassador, appealed to men to accept the gracious offer of forgiveness and reconciliation. The Old Testament forms were more than fulfilled, more than filled full, they were overflowed by the New Testament content. Indeed it is not too much to say that Paul, in using the Old Testament idea of sacrifice as a receptacle for the new revelation in Christ, was engaged in the proverbially dangerous practise of pouring new wine into old and brittle wine-skins; small wonder then that in later Christian history we discover that the skins have burst and the wine has been spilled. Theologians and students of Paul have remembered the defective illustration in terms of propitiatory sacrifice, and have too often forgotten, or allowed to become obscure, the great new Christian gospel of God as always propitious and approachable, the very idea Paul was trying to enforce when he used this in some ways unfortunate illustration. Paul's illustration may have had some value for his contemporaries, but for later generations, greatly as he would have regretted it, it has been a stone of stumbling, a rock of offense. From the great conservative thinkers of the past, Catholic and Protestant, to such theologians as Strong and Warfield in our own day, the mistake has been made of developing the implications of the Old Testament conception of sacrifice, rather than those of the New Testament or Christian revelation of God.

I mention the late Doctor Warfield in view of the republi-

cation, in the third volume of what is to be a ten-volume edition of his collected essays on theological topics, of two articles which originally appeared in the *Harvard Theological Review* in 1912 and 1914, entitled respectively "Christless Christianity" and "The Essence of Christianity and the Cross of Christ." To the former of these, in which some things I had said in an earlier paper had been criticized, I responded, in a paper entitled, "What Is the Christian Religion?" and to this in turn Doctor Warfield replied in the second of the articles mentioned. To this rather lengthy criticism of my position some sixteen years ago no answer has ever been published; but now, since it seems worth while to the friends of Doctor Warfield to republish his article at this late date, it seems to me that it may not be out of place for me to express a few thoughts by way of rejoinder.

In the second of the articles to which I have referred Doctor Warfield charged me with wishing to retain for my religious system the historical name of Christianity, although from his point of view "it utterly repudiates the cross of Christ." On the plea, made in his first paragraph, that from among a number of features of my position which invited comment, a selection must be made, he excused himself from defending what he himself took to be the essence of Christianity against the charge that it was neither rational nor completely moral, and that it could not therefore be reasonably regarded as the true "good essence" of Christianity from the point of view of the interest in a universally valid religion for humanity. Ignoring this, which I had pointed out was the crucial problem in the whole matter under consideration, he confined his efforts to a rather elaborate development of what amounted, practically speaking, to the indictment of his opponent and "liberals" generally as *not being entitled to be regarded as Christians.*

The typical liberal thinks it irrational and impious to believe either that God would be so irrational as to attempt

the impossible, namely, to transfer either guilt or righteousness from one individual to another by mere fiat, or that God would be immoral enough to judge the innocent Jesus and the sinful "believer" as if such an impossible transfer had been made; and for this offense against traditional orthodoxy the liberal is to be denied all right to be considered a Christian.

The really fundamental question here, as I see it, is whether those theologians who stand where the late Doctor Warfield stood are willing to admit in so many words the irrational and incompletely moral nature of what they regard as the most essential part of their own Christianity, namely the doctrine that God made the innocent Jesus guilty—or judged him to be guilty—in order to be able, under whatever conditions, to judge that certain still sinful individuals are free from guilt. Or, if they are not willing to make this admission, just how would they make clear the morality of the external transfer, by divine fiat, of guilt from the sinner to the innocent substitute, or of righteousness from the Saviour to the guilty sinner, and how would they demonstrate the reasonableness of believing in any such transfer? If it be replied that the transfer is not to be thought of as actual, that we must simply think of God as judging *as if* such a transfer had been made, then we must ask just how the rationality and morality of such a mode of judgment on the part of God is to be defended. Is not God's judgment always true? And is not guilt inseparable from the sinful will? Are the guardians of traditional orthodoxy prepared to admit the irrationality and incomplete morality of what they take to be the essence of Christianity? Are they willing to announce that a person must be irrational to be a Christian? If not, let them either defend their theory of the saving work of Christ on rational and moral grounds, or else concede that that theory is not essential to Christian faith. For if one must be irrational to be a Christian, Christianity must be essentially bad; it has no good essence which can survive when separated from its irrational elements.

Now my contention, that the "good essence" of Christianity cannot include any irrational (i. e., anti-rational) or immoral element, is very far from meaning, as my critic seems to have concluded that it meant, that "Christian" is to be regarded as a mere synonym for "rational" and "moral." Here we come upon the one point dealt with in Doctor Warfield's article which may still be profitably discussed somewhat further. Distracting attention from the real issue, as stated above, he seems to intimate that the difference between us, in so far as it is a matter for argument rather than for denunciation, is a difference in the definition of the term "essence." There is a difference here, but it is not so much a difference between my concept of essence and the one actually employed by Doctor Warfield, as it is a difference in the application of the concept in determining just what the essence of Christianity is. My critic, on the firm foundation of a realistic and non-pragmatic theory of existence, defends theoretically, and claims to apply practically, a similar realistic and purely non-pragmatic notion of essence. He is right, it seems to me, in holding to a realistic, non-pragmatic theory of existence; but it can be readily shown that the whole modern controversy over the essence of Christianity, in so far as it is a religious and not a purely historical question, is concerned with "essence" in a pragmatic sense of the word, and it was with this that Doctor Warfield himself was most deeply concerned. It does not follow, however, that a pragmatic definition of essence cannot be at the same time realistic, or even, in a sense, as we shall see, idealistic.

This should be evident from the definition of essence offered in my article and quoted by Doctor Warfield with disapproval. "The essence of the actual," I wrote—and here I was defining the term in the sense of the *good* essence—"is that element in the actual whose continued existence is demanded by the true ideal, and which can retain its actuality and vitality after the elimination of all objectionable elements

from the actual at the demand of that same ideal." Obviously, such a definition is not only pragmatic, involving selection for a purpose; it is at the same time realistic in that it involves a selection from what is independently real and insists that what is selected, if it is to be the real essence, must be capable of continuing in actual existence under the new conditions presupposed. The definition is idealistic also, in the practical sense of the word; the essence is chosen as necessary for the realization of the true ideal, and this true ideal, since it is the ideal for man, includes elements, such as the development of moral personality, which are universally and eternally valid.

By defining essence thus pragmatically, in relation to an ideal and purpose, it is not meant to deny that the term can properly be used in any other way. The term has often been used for all that a thing is, all the qualities the thing in question possesses or has possessed. Such a concept of essence might satisfy the historian of religion or of Christianity, who is not interested in the practical religious problem, but rather in personalities and events, and casual connections between them. But with such a merely historical interest one would be unlikely even to raise the question of essence with reference to religion or Christianity. Everything the religion is or has been is part of its essence; there is no real difference between its essence and its total concrete existence. This is approximately the point of view occupied by Loisy in *The Gospel and the Church.*

But this is unsatisfactory, not only to liberal Protestants like Harnack and Troeltsch: no more could it be accepted by Protestant traditionalists like Doctor Warfield and his followers, who have always held that there is much in what they acknowledge to be the history of Christianity which does not belong to the essence of Christianity. They too make a selection from the total body of historical fact. Without acknowledging it, they themselves use a concept of essence which is virtually pragmatic. The only difference is that they make a

more dogmatic and less discriminating use of the concept when they come to apply it to the body of Christian tradition. They are satisfied to select for survival some one block of traditional content—Calvinism, for instance—instead of weighing each component factor in any such system with reference to its intellectual, religious, and moral value.

The pragmatic concept of essence has its genesis in practical every-day life. To use a homely illustration, the essence of vanilla or of lemon is that in the vanilla bean or the fruit of the lemon which it is essential to extract and preserve for certain practical, culinary purposes; it is not everything that the bean or the fruit is. And so, when our interest in religion or Christianity is the practical human interest, the good essence is that in the reality which it is necessary to conserve in order to realize, as fully and as soon as may be, the highest well-being of humanity. This is not something merely subjective and individualistic; it is as objective and as universally valid as the spiritual ideal, as truth and the good-will and the brotherhood of man. Moreover, such a concept of essence would express not only what religion or Christianity is for us; in stating what is in the actual and what can retain its existence and vitality when separated from all that is unideal, we should be stating what the religion is for itself, as a vital reality.

It may be freely acknowledged that the pragmatic notion of essence is sometimes stated in altogether too subjective a form. This is particularly true of William James's definition of the essence of a thing as "that one of its properties which is so *important for my interests* that in comparison with it I may neglect the rest." From this point of view there is of course "no property *absolutely* essential to any one thing." Doctor Schiller moves a little way toward objectivity when he defines essence as "merely such aspects of the whole behavior as are selected from among the rest by reason either of their relative permanence or of their importance for our purposes."

In criticism of this definition, at least as applied to religion, it may be pointed out that the essence must be important, not simply for our individual purposes but for a universally valid human ideal, and that it is not enough that it be *either* relatively permanent *or* important for the right purpose; it must be both, for only what is permanent enough to be able to remain in existence as long as it is needed can be the real essence of the thing under consideration.

Further fault may be found with Doctor Warfield's interpretation of my position, in view of his assertion that I do not seem "to have considered what would be the effect of the application of this method of determining the essence of a religious system to other religions besides Christianity." As his *reductio ad absurdum* of my position, he claims that logically I should be compelled to think of the religion to which I adhere as embracing the essence of Fetishism and Shamanism, of Bramanism and Buddhism, of Confucianism and Mohammedanism, of Judaism and Christianity, of Romanism and Protestantism, of Arminianism and Calvinism; so that I ought, in his opinion, to consent to be called a Fetishist and a Shamanist, a Buddhist and a Confucian, a Jew and a Mussulman, and so on throughout the whole list of religions and sects. Now it is true enough that, according to our definition of essence, the *good essence* of two very different religions, such as Mormonism and Mohammedanism, might turn out to be the same, the objectionable elements, which are largely different in the two, being eliminated, and only the good which they possess in common being retained. We should also have to say that *ideal religion* would include the *good essence* of each of the religions mentioned by Professor Warfield. It does not follow, however, that *essential Christianity* would include the good essence of every other religion—although I would not be understood as maintaining that it would not. *It is conceivable* (in view of the opposite view not having been proved correct, so far as our argument is concerned) *that the*

good essence of Christianity—that in historic Christianity which is also in ideal religion, or a necessary means to ideal religion—*might still fall short of ideal religion.* But even supposing the good essence of every other religion embraced in the essence of Christianity, it would not follow that he whose religion contains the essence of Christianity ought to call himself a Fetishist or a Shamanist, a Mormon or a Mussulman, or anything but a Christian. Professor Warfield seems to have forgotten what was said about *bad essence.* If the essence of Christianity more nearly coincides with ideal religion than does the essence of any other religion, then that in other religions which most commonly demands the practical attention of the Christian is not their good but their bad essence, that in them which it is essential for the Christian to avoid. By supposition he already (probably) has in his Christianity all their positive values. For the Christian it is the bad essence of Fetishism and Shamanism, of Mohammedanism, and Mormonism, which in each case demands practical attention; it is this bad essence, therefore, which is *the* essence of Fetishism, Shamanism, and the rest. Hence, even though the good essence of Mormonism is included in Christianity, the Christian need not be a Mormon; essential Christianity, while excluding the bad essence of Mormonism, contains its good essence—*and more.*

It is a manifest misinterpretation also when Professor Warfield asserts that in my doctrine of essence "the historical entity is nothing; our ideal is everything." This does not follow from anything I have said. On the contrary one may derive from historic religion not only valuable or even indispensable suggestions for realizing the ideal of religion, but suggestions also which enter into that ideal itself. All human creation of ideals is historically and psychologically conditioned.

I would still maintain, therefore, that the true notion of essence is thoroughly pragmatic. If Christianity is not only a

good religion, but the best historic religion, he has the essence of Christianity who retains those vital elements in historic Christianity which belong to, or are necessary for the realization of the religious ideal; and no sufficient reason was shown by my critic why one whose theory of the saving work of Christ is not that of external penal substitution should be denied the name "Christian." We must therefore call upon the extreme conservative to defend the rationality and morality of his external substitutionary theory of the cross of Christ, or else to do one or the other of two things: either abandon his theory or confess that his view is contrary to reason and morality. For their own sakes it is to be hoped that the more extreme conservatives may be able to modify their position at least sufficiently to be able logically to recognize such men, for example, as Horace Bushnell, William Newton Clarke, and Lyman Abbott, as fellow Christians. Is it Christian to pass judgment upon those in whom the "fruits of the Spirit" are abundantly manifest, who show their faith by their works, and to refuse to recognize them as Christians, simply on the ground that they have a different *theory* of the significance of the death of Christ from one's own? Is it *true* that he who repudiates the theory of an arbitrary transfer of guilt and righteousness from one individual to another thereby "utterly repudiates the cross of Christ"? Is it true that we cannot be Christians if we try to see past the rather faulty illustration in terms of propitiatory sacrifice used by Paul in writing to people in whose traditional religion the offering of sacrifices was central? Must we cease to be Christians if we follow out the logical implications of Paul's doctrine that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself? If we draw the conclusion that only a God who was already propitious and "waiting to be gracious" could take the first step toward reconciliation, must we be denied fellowship with all true disciples of Christ?

There is much more here than the question as to which side was right in a controversy of nearly two decades ago.

The general point of view of the late Doctor Warfield with respect to those who are and those who are not Christians was reiterated by Professor J. G. Machen in his book entitled *Christianity and Liberalism.* All so-called "liberals" were lumped together and labeled "non-Christians." Even some of his undoubtedly "orthodox" colleagues did not escape Professor Machen's criticism when they manifested a tendency to treat some of the "liberals" as if they might possibly be real Christians. And in view of well-known subsequent developments is there any escape from the conclusion that the new Westminster Theological Seminary was really founded on the conviction that no one can be a Christian if in his theory of the atonement he differs from the view held by the late Doctor Warfield and now by Professor Machen?

WHAT IS THE GOOD OF SHAKESPEARE TO US PREACHERS?

CHARLES LUTHER WILLIAMS
Professor Emeritus, Denison University

SOMETIMES when we look up into the sky on a clear night, we think we see a star at a certain point; but as we are not sure, we look a little to the right or left of where we think the star is, and then we see it. We see it indirectly.

Likewise a vast amount of good is achieved in an indirect way, and often the good is all the more pronounced for being thus achieved. This is true, for instance, of the way in which a wholesome moral impression may be conveyed by a novel or drama having real literary merit. In point of importance, such a way of doing good is close to the ideal way of preaching the Gospel.

Of course, we preachers do not relish a piece of literature (alleged literature) that is "erotic, neurotic, or tommy-rotic." Nor, on the other hand, do we care over much perhaps for a piece of artistic writing that has a protuberant moral, a moral that is all the time thrusting itself upon our attention, like the trunk of an elephant, lest we fail to notice it in due measure; but surely the most of us enjoy a novel or drama well written and inculcating a healthful moral sentiment indirectly and unobtrusively; a novel or drama that contains a wholesome moral in solution, as it were. In this paper I should like to show wherein this is true of the dramas we have from Shakespeare.

William Shakespeare was what we should call "a man of the world." He was not a professed moralist. Indeed, there is no evidence that he ever had a definite, distinctly moral purpose in mind while writing a play. He was a dramatist; and so far above all other modern dramatists in the creation and development of human character that when we say about any

one of them, "He stands next to Shakespeare," we do not mean he stands very close to him.

As a dramatist Shakespeare aimed to produce a strictly objective portrayal of human life in action. He held "the mirror up to nature," made a selection from human life in each of his plays. He kept himself in the background while doing this, as he should have done; because when we hold a large looking-glass for objects in front of it to be reflected, the place for us to stand is almost anywhere but in front of the glass.

From what Shakespeare puts into the mouths of his characters we can learn nothing with certainty about his own private opinions as to religion. A person by the name of Birch tried to prove from Shakespeare's plays that he was an atheist. Others in this way have aimed to show that he was a Protestant; and still others that he was a Roman Catholic. This cannot be done. We might as well conclude that a reporter is himself a Democrat because he has given us a verbatim report of a Democratic speech. He may be a seasoned Republican.

A camera does not know better than to "take" anything and everything before it—a pigsty as well as a palace. It has no power of selection. Some of those who write novels and dramas today, who are the apostles of untamed naturalism and who claim to be realists, have the power of selection; but they select only the filthy side of human life. They picture it with monotonous attention to nauseating details. Then holding up to us what they have done, while we, figuratively speaking, hold our noses, they say to us, "You see what life is."

Shakespeare on the other hand exercises his power of selection in accordance with the facts of life. He observes the real proportions of the pure and the impure. In the world of men and women he has created, taken as a whole, the good people and the near good outnumber the bad people and the near bad; as we know they do in the world of living persons, taken as a whole.

He is a moral writer because a truthful one; because, without flinching, he presents the facts of human life as from observation and experience we know them to be. He does this, for instance, in the matter of rewards and penalties.

It is said, "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." That is not always true, as we very well know and as the parable of the Sower clearly teaches. For one thing, some of the seed was picked up by "the fowls of the air." This no doubt did them good, but the sower wanted to reap grain not feed birds. So it is in Shakespeare. It is not always true that a man reaps what he sows. Somebody else, for instance, may reap it.

Unlike Dante, Shakespeare does not concern himself with what is to befall his dramatic personages in the next life but only in this life. And, from a careful survey of his thirty-six or thirty-seven dramas, nothing is more clear than that like the rest of us he believes there is a moral order in this world; an order with its laws which, if obeyed, usually result in victory, but which if disobeyed usually bring defeat. In his plays, as in the world of reality we are acquainted with, the righteous, as a general rule, are rewarded; but not always. Otherwise the noble Cordelia in "King Lear" would not be strangled to death in prison before the play ends. Likewise the unrighteous as a general rule are punished; but not always. Otherwise the two villanous tribunes in "Coriolanus" would not go scotfree before the curtain falls.

Shakespeare pictures human life with such penetrating insight, with a sanity so unimpeachable, with a touch so very sure, and with realism so effective that we can almost hear the merry laughter of Rosalind, or the dying groans of Desdemona. He depicts vice with such rigorous fidelity that we cannot help loathing it; while he delineates virtue with such convincing truthfulness that we should be untrue to ourselves if we did not love it with all our mind and heart.

The main purpose of art is to please, and that is what

Shakespeare does by the perfection of his art as a dramatist; but at the same time he conveys a wholesome moral lesson in a way that is indirect and unobtrusive. Besides, the impression is all the more distinct and abiding for this reason. He does this, for instance, in the case of Iago the villain and of Desdemona the heroine in his great tragedy, "Othello, the Moor of Venice."

Among Shakespeare's villains Iago has the topmost seat. Considering his leading characteristics we see that his ruling motive is revenge. He is almost unbelievably astute. He is an egoist—a hardened one. He is perhaps the most ingenious, the most versatile, and the most intrepid liar ever created by the human imagination. He is an artist in deceiving people, and he is this not for "art's sake," but for the sake of mischief. He makes everybody believe he is "honest"—that is, upright and honorable. He is foul-mouthed. He is also a cynic. If he ever had any of "the milk of human kindness," it has become sour. He even sneers at his own reputation for "honesty" as if it were distasteful to him. He is malignant, venomously so, and he takes delight in torturing innocent people. He "rejoiceth in iniquity" as an end in itself.

Iago is really worse, is really less of a man than Judas Iscariot, for Judas, out of remorse, went and hanged himself, whereas Iago never gives the slightest indication of remorse, but puts the Venetian State to the expense of ending his miserable life. In short, Iago is a full-orbed incarnation of undiluted devilry.

What is our instinctive reaction to this many-sided villain? Even if he were only two-thirds as wicked as he appears in the play, we could not help feeling toward him as we should feel toward a rattlesnake we saw near us, coiled up and ready to strike—provided we did not have a long club in our hands.

To find in Iago anything that fascinates or anything to inspire imitation would imply utter moral depravity in those who found it. To abhor him with passionate abhorrence would

be an indication of moral soundness, and nothing in the play pleases us more than the assurance that Iago reaps what he has sown—to some extent at least. We find satisfaction in knowing that much about him. Such satisfaction may be a moral tonic, and help to purify the soul, as does the righteous indignation that is felt toward all " workers of iniquity."

Desdemona, the heroine of the play, is as much a saint as Iago is a " demi-devil." If she is not a professing Christian like her husband Othello, she certainly is one of the " other sheep " our Lord said were his—a large flock by the way.

She is intelligent, refined, unselfish, and of surpassing beauty. She is modest and gentle, but she is no wilted, insipid personality. She has a mind of her own and she speaks it. She reveals a brave candor and a resolute independence on two occasions. This makes her all the more attractive to us. Most of us relish a bit of pepper on our poached egg for breakfast.

We find no speckless saints in Shakespeare any more than we do in real life; but, as we all know, a person may have some faults and yet be worthy of our warmest affection. The sun has spots on it, but frequently after a shower on a summer afternoon these spots do not prevent the sun from laying a rainbow across the bosom of the clouds. Desdemona is not faultless. She makes mistakes—innocently, to be sure—but Shakespeare, the truthful and impartial interpreter of human life, sees to it that she suffers the bitter consequences of her mistakes.

The innocence of her soul, however, remains without a stain. She never means the least harm to anyone and she always intends the largest good to everybody. Her love for Othello is as pure and strong as ever won the smile of Heaven or invited the visits of angels. She is so entirely without suspicion herself that she cannot understand why Othello should doubt her loyalty to him; and, when she is forced to believe that he distrusts her, she is completely stunned.

Desdemona does not blaze out in wrath. She suffers in

quiet submission, and when she thinks she has lost the love of Othello, she feels that she herself is lost—lost to all happiness in life. She is murdered by him, but she loves him to the very last. We forget all about the mistakes of Desdemona as we read the words with which her beautiful life comes to a close; words referring to Othello her husband, but her murderer; words that reflect so distinctly the spirit of Christ on the Cross praying for his enemies, " Commend me to my kind lord, O farewell."

Desdemona sowed goodness in abundant measure. She reaped disappointment and pain in large measure; but her death was not a defeat. It was a victory. It made her more of a saint to be adored than if she had died a natural death. It proved the superior capacity of her sex for sacrificial love. It made the charm of her stainless wifehood all the more vivid. Desdemona produces in all who know her " the moral sensation of pathos," and this helps to enrich and sweeten their life.

As there are flowers whose fragrance is never revealed to us so plainly as when they are crushed, so the spiritual beauty of Desdemona's life is made all the more appealing to us by the heroic way she accepted the cruel fortunes that fell to her lot. To know such a woman is to admire her, and with an admiration, too, that is in itself a stimulus to beautiful living.

THE CHRISTIAN'S USE OF THE BIBLE

STEWART G. COLE

I. The Modern Man's Dilemma

Historically, the Bible has been one of the chief sources of inspiration for the good life in Protestant Christianity. Today, one can observe the shift of this Book from its central place in Christian faith toward the circumference of personal regard. Not only are other literary materials being discovered which prove increasingly attractive for devotional purposes, but for many Christians the Scriptures themselves are losing their appeal as primary sources of spiritual edification. This condition cannot remain without endangering the principles of evangelicalism; and, more particularly, the preeminence of the Book's central figure in Christian loyalty (Jesus Christ), a fact that would bring very grave consequences to western religion.

How many liberal scholars are aware that their cherished method of approach to biblical study puts in jeopardy the literary resources of Christian faith? For, the historical reconstruction of ancient Hebrew and Christian cultures has not only brought to light the ideals that actuated a particular succession of prophets, priests, and peoples, but it has also represented the Bible as simply one source-book among many in the history of Mediterranean religions. By means of technical scholarship men are discovering certain truths about the origin of Christianity, but their view-point is contributing also to the breakdown of the propriety of scriptural precepts for present-day Christian living. The human Jesus rather than a supernaturally normative Christ has claimed their consideration, and they are searching for him as one striving to release his copatriots from the shackles of an unbearable politico-priestly order. In brief, the Book that traditionally was considered as "the Word of God," disciples of the historical school treat as

the uncritical and picturesque records of a race of men in quest for God. And this latter *modus operandi* is fast becoming the property of ecclesiastical leadership, with consequent valuational loss in Christian faith.

The dangers involved in this religious situation impressed themselves upon the writer with fresh emphasis during recent study in Germany. Perhaps the remark of Professor Martin Debilius of the University of Heidelberg that "the scholar cannot find in the historic Jesus sources of power sufficient to satisfy the Christian's faith," defined the issue most succinctly. What does the modern student find? His anthropological presuppositions of inquiry require that he seek to interpret this person as any other individual in a given *Zeitgeist*. After the most painstaking investigation he concludes that the eschatological and miraculous elements which envelop Jesus are due to current thought-movements used to explain a religious genius, and cannot be accepted as authentic twentieth-century descriptions of the Galilean's manner of life. Besides, he discovers that many well-known formularies concerning Jesus' life and teachings, which Christians had supposed for centuries were trustworthy, are open to question. Some of these mooted points concern his person in its most significant aspects. The latest "biographies" of Jesus, written by the most learned authorities on early Christianity, are not life-histories of the subject in any real sense whatever. Rather, they throw fresh light on a buffer civilization in which the partially-concealed Jesus was a prime mover. The scholar's approach to the Bible makes it an historically conditioned text, and Jesus one about whom present-day churchmen must be willing to entertain tentatively a considerable degree of agnosticism.

But even more seriously does this scriptural view-point undercut the grounds of Christian faith. It weakens the traditional basis of theistic belief, and it is certain to unsettle further the moorings of lay Christians as they give more thought to the logic of their changing biblical convictions. A man who

rests his understanding of the Scriptures upon historical research cannot draw any direct deductions from them about the nature or character of God; for the reason that his method of inquiry makes no place for extra-human postulates or conclusions. Should one claim any theistic doctrines in his study, he would make them in violence to the rules of historics, however true they might be as a result of other inquiries. The writer is simply pointing out that the Christian who is limited to a literary-sociological view of the Bible (the prevailing view in the Bible departments of every liberal divinity school in America), is left without theistic support for his religion from the source that his Protestant forebears considered a mainspring of divine inspiration.

Although this view-point represents the logic of biblical introduction, it is advisable to remind ourselves that the modern student of the Bible, in so far as he has embraced a more reliable method of textual inquiry than former generations, has discovered a more trustworthy understanding of the Hebrew faith and primitive Christianity. Christians should welcome new light on the ancient past, however relative the shafts of illumination may be. But, on the other hand, the same investigation leaves the religious man without any information bearing upon a God who "revealed" himself through a select people, in the ideals of their prophets, and preeminently in Jesus of Nazareth. Practically, the cultural loss is registered today in the wide-spread neglect of the Bible as a source of spiritual power; philosophically, the omission is foreboding for those who desire to think of progressive Christianity in a rational manner. If Bible scholarship has nothing enlightening to say about deity, revelation, salvation, but only unravels the social forces said to have given birth and direction to Christianity in a cross-fertilization of ancient cultures, from what source can a Christian draw his faith to remain a believer in God and in His Son, Jesus Christ? Or, must he resign himself to certain principles of Hebrew-Hellenistic anthropology or humanism,

the logical outcome of current biblical scholarship. Surrender his search for Truth, he dare not; remain a Christian, he must.[1]

II. The Barthian Solution

The full import of this religious dilemma hung as a heavy load upon Karl Barth, the Swiss rural preacher, and led him to rethink the fundamental bases of contemporary Christian faith. Likewise, it challenged Rudolf Bultmann of Marburg and Emil Brunner of Zurich, New Testament and Systematic Theology scholars respectively, and led them to take a position closely akin to that of Barth. These men have grasped both horns of the dilemma and have construed a positive gospel of faith for their time. Disturbed European teachers and preachers by scores have embraced their view-point, until the Barthian movement has penetrated every part of the Continent and given church leadership a new lease of evangelical power. A half-century of the *religionsgeschichte* school of thought had resulted in extracting from the Scriptures their devotional nerve; the Barthians have rediscovered the sense of spiritual immediacy in human life. While most Americans have been content to gloss over the revolutionary religious and theistic changes incident to historico-critical biblicism, certain German thinkers have been meeting the "crisis" of liberal Christianity and conceiving a sufficient gospel (i. e., "the theology of crisis") to overcome the rather arid rationalism of this scientific age.

Where American scholars had substituted history and psychology for theology in their approach to the Bible, Barth restored the latter discipline to its former rôle as "the queen of the sciences." But not as an apologetic for orthodoxy! He encourages every effort of biblicists to reconstruct the early episodes of Christian history. The most liberal claims made for the Synoptics and Jesus, if well established, are welcome

[1] The timeliness of the first imperative has been given trenchant consideration in the article, "Why Technical Scholarship?" Morton S. Enslin, Crozer Quarterly, July, 1930, pp. 328-340; the vocational imperative is as important for the perpetuation of the Christian cult.

findings in that deserving enterprise. Old and New Testament scholarship must not suffer from any popular disregard of their prerogatives. These men must be encouraged to pursue the truth without fear or favor. The Barthian would have the investigator remember, however, that every claim he makes is purely "human" in source and content. For Jesus was human; the Bible is a human document; and biblical students and their most valid claims are human. None reveals God, nor do they bear His image. The Bible, historically interpreted, is not the Word of God! It is the "word of man." [2] By this logical procedure, Barthians reenforce the implicit doctrines of liberal rationalism; and in doing so, only stress the theological subjectivism into which most liberals, without any alternative, have allowed themselves to drift.

What, then, is the "Word of God," and its doctrinal elucidation, theology? The Barthians preface religion by declaring for the primacy of "God" in Christian experience. In contradistinction to contemporary emphasis upon extreme immanence in religion and its likely outcome, humanism, they lay down as the major premise of Christianity the belief that God is absolutely transcendent to this world-order; His absolute holiness does not allow him to dwell within the structure of this sinful realm of human affairs. As the early Christians concluded, so must we, that there is an "eschatological gulf between the world of God and the world as it is." [3] The minor premise claims that this gulf *may* be bridged in human history: God *may* reveal himself in Jesus Christ. The record of the actual meeting of "transcendence" and "immanence" is reported in the Gospels. But, says Brunner, "he who identifies the letter of the Scriptures with the word of God has never truly understood the word of God." When the Holy Spirit of God speaks to any man, he does so through the vehicle of the Bible; but the

[2] *Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie,* English Translation, *The Word of God and the Word of Man,* Karl Barth.

[3] In *The Theology of Crisis,* by Emil Brunner, the reader finds the clearest enunciation of Barthian principles.

content of his message is immediate and spiritual, not verbal and rational.

Herein is a paradox: God's "Word" utterly transcends human reason, as its Author transcends man. Yet man may have spiritual commerce with Him! Never by simply studying the Christian's Book, but by an *initial* act of God upon the reader who uses the book "by faith." The Christian will know when the Holy Spirit has spoken to him, because of the increment of redeeming grace that has entered his life during the devotional experience. Man's faith is fundamental, and may be defined as an absolute and daring assertion of confidence in the seeking will of God. Unless the Christian is nourished constantly by "the Word of God," he dies of spiritual starvation, however well-informed he may be in the truths of the historically-conditioned Bible. The Bible is the revelation of God to a man *when* the former speaks to the latter through it; He may speak *when* an individual fulfils the condition of a contrite spirit and a believing faith.

Barthians resort to dialectical processes of thinking to cover the gap between the contribution of divine revelation and the truths of human reason. God's Word is suprarational, absolute, eternal; man's best thought of Him is relative, incomplete, this-worldly. Nothing man says about God is self-evident; every declaration raises a question. Barthian theology is full of paradoxes. Space does not permit an analysis of the theory of knowledge here. Suffice it to say, that this viewpoint permits its apostles to restate the doctrines of human guilt, sin, faith, grace, atonement, salvation, and so forth, and to bring back these historic rubrics of evangelicalism to a primary place in preaching and doctrine. It also reenthrones God as Sovereign in Christianity, as no theology has since Calvinism. For conservative Christians, Barthianism has the merit that it cherishes the great values of the Protestant Reformation, and that it restores an objective authority in religion. That the position provides for man's freest investigation of

the Scriptures and the embrace of the most tentative views of critical scholarship, makes it attractive to many liberal-minded Christians. And yet Barthianism cuts across Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Arminianism; fundamentalism, modernism, and humanism. It is neither fish, fowl, nor flesh, to the historical theologian; it answers the age-old search for God and salvation by meeting a "crisis" in current Christianity and setting up a new *Weltanschauung.*

III. Have Americans an Alternative Answer?

However appropriate Barthianism is in continental Europe, it will scarcely commend itself to most American churchmen. Only a very few leading evangelicals in this country have become Barthian disciples. Conservative Christians in the West could not approve such criticism of scriptural materials as Bultmann, Gogarten, and their group, make; far less accept their conclusions. Liberal leaders will repudiate the position on at least three grounds: there is a central chord of despair in the theological outlook that is foreign to the American "mind"; scholarship in America is committed to some phase of monistic worldview in this age of science and, for that reason, cannot consider seriously the eschatological argument common to early Christianity and to the Barthians; and the scholasticism found necessary to lend rational significance to faith, cannot stand before the confidence westerners have in "straight thinking." To mention but one difficulty in the Barthian view—if all the labors of New Testament scholars to discover the historic Jesus eventuate in piecemeal knowledge only, and if it throws no light whatever on primary values of surviving Christianity, then to what end is the workmanship and why should Christians engage in it? The real purport of the European movement for Americans is not that it answers satisfactorily one of the most persistent problems in liberal Christianity, but rather that it lifts that problem into clear relief and leads the West to see how critical the situation is for

religion in reference to it, and how inadequate liberal doctrine is on account of it.

If not Barthianism, then what? American men are committed beyond question to the historical approach to the Bible. The truth will be told about its chief personage only as men by disciplined imagination reproduce the social conditions in the ancient world that paved the way for Jesus, that defined for him his task, and that gave content to his message. But Christians are determined likewise to retain the regal figure of Christ in their personal and institutional faith. This One is looked upon as associating more closely with God than any ordinary man, and he serves the purpose to lead people into fellowship with the Power that makes for justice and love in the universe. For that reason, the Scriptures will remain *the* Book of the Christian Church and contribute their share to the illumination of the Christian's Paraclete. How, then, shall liberal men meet the crisis in theology here as in Europe? How are they to conceive the relation of the personal Jesus and the Christ of faith? How shall churchmen associate the fruits of scholarship and the inspirational art in the use of the Bible? In what manner may the historical God be said to have fellowship with the twentieth-century man?

It lies beyond the intention of the writer to sketch here any adequate answer to these issues that take on acute significance for this day. Briefly, are there not in circulation at least four types of answer which are subject to clarification? Certain liberal Christians tend to belittle the antithesis previously defined, and to assume somewhat blandly that the supposed incongruities would vanish quickly if men only gave hearty enthusiasm to "the cause of Christ." These men confuse the American spirit to "get ahead" with clear thinking; they only store up greater difficulties later on by short-circuiting fundamental problems of Christian understanding. Others, like Karl Barth, grant that Jesus is one and that Christ is another; but, unlike him, they choose to maintain their New

Testament learning and their inspirational interests as quite unrelated functions of personality. It is comely to be scholar-like; and it is urgent to have a "message." Consciously or unconsciously, they entertain a dualistic view of the Bible and of God. If hard pressed for a harmonious valuation, they patch one up for the occasion.

A third representative Christian grants that Jesus was a socially oriented man, and that the Christ of Bible-interest and subsequent Christianity was the disciples' idealization of this first-century prophet, saint, and martyr.[4] He recognizes the personification of loyalty as a primary force in the propagation of religion; "loyalty to Christ" has been the golden thread upon which the precious pearls of religious experience have been strung through the Christian centuries. Granting the propriety of this view, a scholar may accept the verdict of history about Jesus and about the development of Christological belief, and yet remain free to attach to Jesus Christ such satisfying values as the religious needs of his day call forth. For him, the Scriptures become a great treasure of historic idealism and are used in religious ministry as a highly selective symposium on Christian symbolism, rather than a text-book of Christian norms, program, or doctrine. And the *spirit* of the Bible is stressed above slavish dependence upon fine historical technique in the parish use of the Book. However sound this scholarly approach to Jesus may be, its bearer should not fail to observe that he hurdles the theistic problem that has been defined earlier in this article. For this believer, in strict harmony with approved psychological procedure, has left himself

[4] Perhaps no words on this theme indicate more clearly and convincingly the direction in which modern scholarship has been moving in reference to Christology than the following: "It is the Christ of faith whom we meet in the New Testament writings just as truly as it is the Christ of faith who is set forth in the ecumenical creeds. . . And it seems difficult to press with certainty very far back of this Christ of faith. Any attempt to get back of the New Testament faith will simply mean the substitution of the critics' interpretation of Jesus for the interpretations given by John or by Paul or by Mark." "The question which I wish to raise is whether every Christology, whatever its content, does not contain elements which cannot be traced to the historical at all." "And if we must continue to find in the *verifiable* traits of the historic Jesus *all* that faith needs to affirm, faith will inevitably be made poorer by the more cautious and critical attitude of modern scholarship." Article, "The Christ of Faith and the Jesus of History," Gerald Birney Smith, *American Journal of Theology,* Vol. XVIII, October, 1914, pp. 537, 539, 544.

without any complementary philosophy of religion. Both Jesus and Christ are accounted for on strictly human bases of investigation; and Christianity in its rational exposition is left without cosmic connections.[5]

Still another view is relevant. Its sponsor believes that there is the strict historian's method of biblical introduction; and there is also the religious person's technique of Bible-employment. Both are legitimate and praiseworthy. The former individual approaches the content of the Scriptures as he would the writings of Virgil or Tacitus, and interprets them in thoroughly objective fashion. The latter person introduces an important factor in his study which the scientist does not possess: he brings to his study a subjective criterion of the experience of religion. This experience induces him to use certain postulates in appreciating the life and work of Jesus, and to arrive at theological deductions that have metaphysical (as well as valuational) basis in the sources of Christianity. The " essence " of religion that characterizes this man's experience is also the " essence " that actuated and empowered the person of Jesus Christ. Only it was found in the New Testament figure in a uniquely superior manifestation.[6]

However convincing this position is to these men, they would have considerable difficulty in convincing the historian that they based their evaluation of the Saviour, whose life and teachings they find in the Gospels, upon sufficiently well-authenticated references to the Galilean. They are selective in their use of synoptic materials, and they assume that such selections are *bona-fide* representations of the Master's life and ministry. The historian also finds it difficult to grant the validity of an " essence " view of Christianity.

In conclusion, the Christian's use of the Bible raises a twofold problem today. On the one hand, critical scholarship

[5] Shailer Mathews in *The Atonement and the Social Process,* has used a psychological (rather than a metaphysical) pattern to join Christianity and the cosmos (p. 187 f.). This method represents the most helpfully constructive Christian view that the historical theologian can give.

[6] This position is taken in Harry Emerson Fosdick's book, *The Modern Use of the Bible,* Chap. VIII; and in the classical study, *The Idea of the Holy,* Rudolf Otto, pp. 162-65; Chap. XX.

has humanized the Protestant's Book to show how a particular people organized its manner of life and thought to define for themselves the will of God. This view is incongruous with our inherited belief either that the Bible is or that it contains " the Word of God." On the other hand, presuming that the Christian can lay valid claim to the hypothesis that God has revealed himself to man in the Scriptures, then he faces the necessity of accommodating the theistic claims of this historic religion (and in particular of the sacred writings of Christianity) with those of naturalistic religious philosophy. For, only when the objective implications of a contemporary cosmic world-view and the subjective determinants of historic Christianity are coordinated can Protestantism possess a theistic directive by which to move forward and to build a better world.

SOME FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

MORTON S. ENSLIN

It would probably be not overrash to hazard that for the average Christian the most important detail of the Pentecost story, now receiving especial consideration, is the reference to the baptism of those whose hearts had been pricked by Peter's sermon. Yet it may be safely asserted that of all the elements in this somewhat surprising story there is none more improbable. The somewhat disquieting miracle of speech—each man hearing in his own tongue, and yet being able to realize his neighbor was having the same experience—may well be, as we shall later see, a pretty drastic reworking of a simpler story which the author of the book of Acts either misunderstood or corrected intentionally to suit his purpose; yet the more one studies the early history of the Jerusalem group, the more probable it seems that early in its history its members underwent an experience of emotional excitement that convinced them that they had become heir to the same divine spirit which had empowered Jesus to perform his mighty work as a prophet of God like to those of old and to herald the approach of the New Age. Even the stupendous number 3,000 does not cause the historian undue difficulty, for he well knows that early writers were quite indifferent to the use of the decimal point in recording figures, while in the warm and fertile seed-plot of tradition stupendous growths took place. But this cool and unaffected statement in verses 38 and 41 that the multitude accepted unhesitatingly the baptism which Peter prescribed is most extraordinary. As we shall see, this is not germane to the Pentecost narrative which is concerned with the fulfilment of Jesus' promise that they should receive the Holy Spirit—"for John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized

in the Holy Spirit not many days hence."[1] Baptism, thus, in the Spirit is not a consequence of baptism in water, but a substitute for it. And brought in, almost lamely, after the moving and vivid account of the way this promise had been fulfilled, the mention of the water baptism, which will make possible the reception of that which in fact they have already received without it, seems a forced anticlimax, perfectly natural perhaps at the time when the book of Acts finally saw the light of day, when possession of the Spirit, and entrance into the church had long been recognized to be possible only as a consequence of baptism in water.

But this brings us to the next point. This situation undoubtedly prevailed at the end of the first century, very possibly considerably earlier, but it is most unlikely in these early Jerusalem days. So, the chief difficulty with this favorite element in the Pentecost narrative is not its limping appearance, as an unnecessary and anticlimactic note, but the mention of baptism at all in the group at this early date, particularly in the calm matter-of-fact way Peter is made to prescribe it, as if it were of long standing and a well-known requirement.

To the orthodox exponents of catholic theology this was not a serious difficulty. Did not the Gospel of John record that Jesus' disciples in the early days of the Judæan ministry had surpassed John in this method of making converts; nay, more than that, had not the risen glorified Lord in his last fateful appearance in Galilee, endued with all authority on earth as well as in heaven, bidden his gathered disciples to make disciples of all the nations, "baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"? In the face of such a command what wonder his followers obeyed, especially as his precept had the hallowing sanction of his own example, when, months before, he himself had stepped into the Jordan waters in answer to the clarion call of John?

But recent years have shown that here as elsewhere ortho-

[1] Acts 1: 5.

doxy and historicity have surprisingly little in common. Most interpreters of the Fourth Gospel are very loath to use as material for reconstructing the enigmatic pages of the earthly ministry of Jesus material unique to this writing; outside this bare reference in John there is no hint of baptism having been practised or ordained by Jesus.[2] It may well be that these verses in John are due simply to the author's view (which he shared with all his contemporaries, and, it may be remarked parenthetically, with many since his day) that whatever was in effect with divine sanction in his own day had always so been.

> As it is now at this instant,
> So was and ever shall be.
> World without end. Amen, Amen.

Yet I have a haunting suspicion that here as elsewhere material in itself palpably unhistoric may yet yield a glimpse of truth. It is to be noted that in these verses in question the author corrects himself. 3:22 reads: "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa; and there he tarried with them and baptized," while 4:1f. commences: "When therefore the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John." But then follows a curious clause of qualification: "although Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." It may be asserted that this qualification was due to John's unwillingness to ascribe such a task to Jesus, as below the dignity of the Son of God. But if this be the case, he is amazingly free from such scruples in the later narrative of the washing of the disciples' feet. To me a much more probable explanation of the clause is that there had persisted even to John's day a tradition that Jesus had not baptized. With his view, universally held, that baptism had yet been in vogue from the very beginning, this tradition had come to be understood, "Jesus himself refrained

[2] Of course with the exception of Matthew 28:19, to be discussed presently, and the palpably unhistoric and late Mark 16:16 which now stands in some manuscripts as a conclusion to the Gospel.

from the act; his disciples, however, performed it." But as a matter of fact it is vastly more probable that such a tradition would really have meant that baptism was not a phase of the Master's ministry at all; as Jesus preached and worked, so did his disciples. Accordingly, this verse, although historically of small worth, may well attest the preservation of an old bit of information which, as is too often the case, has been subjected to gratuitous interpretation.

A very brief word is sufficient for the so-called Great Commission. That these words cannot possibly be received as a genuine logion of Jesus is so universally accepted by scholars, and there are so many excellent discussions available, that it seems needless to belabor the point. As has been said in a different connection, " One does not use battering-rams on gates that stand open." It is not even necessary to point out that in view of the distinct command to baptize " into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit " (the later orthodox formula of the Church, and the only one that is valid according to Catholic law) the disregard of the formula in the reports of Acts and Paul is most amazing. The decisive objection is the attitude of the early Jerusalem group, as attested by both Acts and Paul, to a gentile mission. Those who had heard burning words from the risen Lord of life could hardly have needed an experience with Cornelius. If anything is certain in the misty pages of Christian Beginnings, it is that the traditional words, in substance as well as in form, are a late reflection of Christian practise from a period when the example and precept of the Master, " Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," had long since lapsed, to be preserved only in their Bibles.

This entire disregard of baptism, both in practise and in injunction, is surprising in line with the story with which the Gospel narratives open, the baptism of Jesus by John. In this simple and affecting story there is a difficulty not often consid-

ered. As the account in Mark stands—and since his version is the source of those in Matthew and Luke we can limit our attention to it for the moment—it is apparently a critical experience for Jesus, a turning-point, a time of polarizing of energy. It does not seem an unwarranted assumption that it must have been a signal moment. Then it was that God's Holy Spirit descended upon him and laid hold of him, transforming him into God's own prophet, commissioned from on high to sound the clarion call to repentance in preparation for the new age soon to dawn. Unless the details of the story are sheer fabrication, they can hardly be other than the verbal paraphrase of Jesus' experience, which he had communicated to his followers. If this is the case, how surprising it is that an experience of such moment to himself should not have commended itself to him as valuable to his hearers. This can easily be exaggerated. I have no intention of trying to represent Jesus as a high churchman with a developed sacramental outlook toward baptism. Yet human nature being what it is, it is most surprising to discover a man who has been profoundly moved by an experience not prescribing it for others, or at least not being sensible of its possible value. Accordingly, there is the temptation to consider the story a later invention from a time when baptism was universal.

But in answer to this is a familiar line of reasoning. Much of the material of the Gospels—perhaps most of it—reflects the age of the Gospel writers themselves, with the result that the Gospels at a conservative estimate are fully as valuable as sources of knowledge of their authors' age as they are for that of the ministry of Jesus. It is not only conceivable but demonstrable that the framers of our Gospels—and their sources as well—selected the material which they felt would be of value for the purposes in hand and often freely revamped and altered it to make it more acceptable. In the attempt to determine what is and what is not genuine historic material Professor Schmiedel urged those passages which from their

nature and implication could not possibly be conceived as having been produced by Jesus' later worshipers. On this basis many interpreters have agreed that Mark's baptism story should be included, although Schmiedel himself did not list it in his famous nine "pillar passages." [3] I have myself argued in similar strain:

> The introduction of the dialogue between Jesus and John at the time of the baptism (Matt. 3:14, 15) and the suppression of the inconvenient words of Mark "unto remission of sins" are palpably later Christian touches, obvious in their purpose; but recognition of this should not blind us to the fact that an inconvenient story such as that of the baptism of Jesus can hardly be seen as framed for purposes however practical by a group of worshipers who reckoned him as sinless and standing in no need of repentance. One would hardly err in classing this incident along with the other "pillars." [4]

I am not so sure of this judgment as I was when I penned it. That Matthew took great offense at the Markan story is clear; and his protest in the form of the dialogue referred to is unmistakable. Nor, unless I am greatly mistaken, is the reference in Luke's account accidental.

> Now it came to pass, when all the people were baptized, that, Jesus also having been baptized, . .[5]

It is apparently another attempt to differentiate Jesus' baptism from that of the rest, and evidences a dissatisfaction with the Markan narrative.

But was Mark sensible of these difficulties? Did he phrase it thus, in spite of his theological scruples, or was he blissfully unaware that his unstudied words were charged with theological dynamite? This question, apparently overlooked by interpreters of the second Gospel, is of first importance. As is so often the case, a similar narrative may cast some light.

[3] For the list see *Encyclopedia Biblica*, pp. 1881-85.

[4] "An Additional Step Toward the Understanding of Jesus," *Journal of Religion*, Vol. IX, No. 3 (July, 1929), pp. 424 f.

[5] Luke 3: 23.

Another passage that gave Matthew keen offense was Mark 8: 27-30, the famous Cæsarea Philippi incident. Here according to Mark's account Jesus asks his disciples who men say he is. They make different answers: "John the Baptist, Elijah, One of the prophets." Upon being pressed for his opinion, Peter gives it, and is instantly rebuked. Matthew, as is of course well known, preserves the Markan story, but sweetens it up by the insertion of a strain of Petrine tradition —does this come from Antioch where apparently Peter was at an early date bishop of the church? The point to be observed is that Mark's narrative suggests clearly that although Jesus had asked the question explicitly, he was by no means pleased with the response, or at least in no uncertain terms forbade its mention. Matthew senses this, and has Jesus commend Peter cordially for his superhuman insight. But did Mark mean that Jesus was displeased? Certainly not. Immediately following this incident is that of the transfiguration, which in turn is followed by the healing of the epileptic boy. Why did Mark arrange his material in this way? Hardly because the incidents actually occurred in this sequence. Simply because Mark has a narrative that is lively and progressive, and because Matthew and Luke use this outline as the framework of their Gospels should not blind our eyes to the fact that it is very probably an artificial arrangement. Because *A*, *B*, and *C* all tell the same story, you have only one witness to its accuracy provided *A* is the sole source of knowledge possessed by *B* and *C*. And Papias, a second-century disciple whose work has unfortunately been lost, uttered a warning, still preserved in Eusebius, the dean of all subsequent church historians, that Mark's narrative was not in chronological order (*οὐ μέντοι τάξει*) since he had neither heard the Lord nor been a disciple of his. If a little greater heed had been paid to this comment, much less confidence would have been felt in the chronological arrangement that Mark happened to make of the incidents he chose to record.

Now this little detour is not aimless. These three incidents in Mark: Cæsarea Philippi, the transfiguration, and the healing of the epileptic boy, are artificially joined together; and the reasons are easy to see. In the transfiguration Jesus with three of his disciples is absent from the rest. The story of the epileptic boy presupposes Jesus' absence from his disciples. The disciples could not heal him; Jesus could. The contrast is clear, Jesus *vs.* the disciples, not Jesus and the chosen three *vs.* the nine. But as Mark is casting his narrative, this absence of Jesus affords a good locat for the story. The fact that the three are with him is incidental and of no concern to Mark.

This gives us the clew. Just as this incident is tacked on to that which precedes, not because tradition said it happened in that sequence, but because Mark chose to string his beads in that order, so it is more than probable that the so-called transfiguration incident is attached to the episode at Cæsarea Philippi, not because actually it transpired thus, but as the divine, heavenly authentication of the preceding. Peter had given the correct reply; God now spoke from heaven in attestation.

It appears to me highly probable that in this mountain experience we have a somewhat recast story of a resurrection appearance. It is by no means unlike in character the appearance of the glorified Christ with which the Gospel of Matthew comes to its majestic close. With the emphasis that the early church laid on the resurrection it is scarcely improbable that many stories of those never-to-be-forgotten revelations were then in circulation, which are now unhappily lost. For example, in his famous catalogue of epiphanies in 1 Corinthians 15 Paul has heard of several not preserved in Gospel tradition. Nor apparently were they always preserved in their original setting. One example will suffice. Mark follows his mention of Jesus' appearance in Galilee with the account of the call of the first four disciples, one of whom was Peter.[6] Matthew follows Mark, not only as regards order but in substantial agree-

[6] Mark 1: 16-20.

ment.[7] Luke, however, goes his own way, and omits this Markan section; but a little later in his narrative, under the influence of the Markan passage, recasts a story of Peter's wonderful fishing trip to make of it a substitute.[8] The story as he tells it is completely concerned with Peter; but at the end, a forced reference to James and John is inserted, although in the next breath they are disregarded and Peter is again the only figure. "And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men." Now if this Lukan story be compared with the incident in the last chapter of John,[9] probably few will doubt that both stories rest on a common tradition. And in John the story is of a resurrection appearance. A careful examination of the two accounts will convince most, I fancy, that Luke has thus adopted a story, for his own purposes, to fit it into his narrative. The presumption is that Mark has acted similarly in the case of the famous confession, and has used this convenient story as a divine authentication of Peter's insight.

The import of this, if my judgment is correct, is highly significant. It would reveal at once that in Mark's eyes Peter's answer is the correct one; therefore, of course, Jesus is not displeased at it. The appearance of displeasure is due to Mark's unpremeditated style—or is it that he is faithfully following a source where Jesus actually did disapprove but without recognizing this attitude, since he is so certain that Jesus did so consider himself? At any rate, the juxtaposition of the two incidents makes perfectly clear that Mark had no intention of discountenancing Peter's identification and that he would have been probably quite amazed had he known that later Christians, as Matthew, would take his account amiss.

In the light of this apparent situation it appears to me highly probable that the same style of reasoning may apply in the case of his story of the baptism. It is not that he is obliged

[7] Matthew 4: 18-22.
[8] Luke 5: 1-11.
[9] John 21: 1-14.

out of sheer historical honesty—in fact, such a sense is a quite modern invention—to retain such disconcerting elements as the statements that Jesus was baptized by John and that John's baptism was one of repentance unto remission of sins. Apparently, as has been suggested, he was blissfully unaware of the offense his words might provoke. Only when they had been read and reread did dissatisfaction arise. If this be the case, the "stubborn fact" of the story disappears, and the story itself may perfectly well have been invented, its difficulties being quite incidentally and unstudiedly introduced.

But the question may naturally be raised: What was the point of fabricating such a tradition? In addition to the obvious value of allowing Jesus' sacred example to hallow a custom now universal[10] is another which involved John the Baptist.

One of the many fruitful results of modern New Testament criticism is the recognition that the story of John the Baptist, as it stands in our Gospels, has gone through a pretty drastic rewriting. In fact, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that it has been christianized. A recent essay[11] by Professor Parsons of the Colgate-Rochester faculty puts the facts succinctly. It is unnecessary to do more than outline the situation at this time. In Mark, John the Baptist appears spectacularly in Judæa and in dramatic fashion sounds a note of doom worthy of Jeremiah or Amos. In addition he baptizes those who come. Jesus appears among the throng of penitents, and is baptized. There is no hint of any recognition of him by John, or that it is he who is to be the "greater one" John is so eloquently proclaiming. In Matthew, however, as has been

[10] Our confidence would be greater of course if the Gospels had accounts of the baptism of the Twelve. It is not, however, without interest to observe that in Moschus' *Spiritual Meadow*, chap. 176, it is said: "Yes, truly, the apostles were baptized, as Clement the Stromatist relates in the fifth book of the *Hypotyposes*. For, in explaining the apostolic statement, 'I thank God that I baptized none of you,' he says, Christ is said to have baptized Peter alone, and Peter Andrew, and Andrew John, and then James and the rest." (*Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Vol. XXIV, p. 159.) Tertullian (*On Baptism*, chap. 12) argues that since it is expressly stated that "the *opponents* of the Lord *refused* to be baptized" it is probable that "they who *followed* the Lord *were* baptized."

[11] *Studies in Early Christianity*, edited by S. J. Case, pp. 151-170.

remarked earlier in this essay, a definitely Christian note has been introduced. When Jesus comes to be baptized, John at once recognizes him, and demurs at Jesus' request. "Nay," says he in substance, "it would be far more fitting for you to baptize me." "You are quite right," Jesus is made to reply, "but suffer it to be done." In the light of this obvious recognition by Jesus of his dignity the heavenly voice can no longer say —as Mark recorded it—"Thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased." Rather it proclaims to those who need the information, "This is my beloved son." In Luke's account this process of subordinating John to Jesus is carried a step further. Even before their births they had met. When Mary in whom was the divinely begotten Lord came into the presence of the pregnant Elisabeth, the latter's babe leaped in her womb, prompting words from Elisabeth which made Mary's *Magnificat* possible. In the Fourth Gospel the climax is reached. John is of a truth only the voice which proclaims Jesus. The author is familiar with the story of the baptism, but of course recasts it. How unfitting that the divine Word should have been baptized! Rather the Baptist sees him approaching and heralds him: "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man who is become before me; for he was before me." [12] The dove is present, but not for Jesus. Well does the Lord know his own identity. Rather the appearance is for John, the herald: "And John bare witness, saying, I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven; and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize in water, he said unto me, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon him, the same is he that baptizeth in the Holy Spirit. And I have seen, and have borne witness that this is the Son of God." [13] That John the Baptist thus was transformed by Christianity from an independent preacher to the forerunner of Jesus can hardly be

[12] John 1: 29 f. [13] John 1: 32-34.

doubted. Nor is it improbable that his message has been made an essentially Christian message. It is to be observed that Matthew makes him utter precisely the same clarion call as did Jesus: "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3:2; 4:17). The special teaching of John which Luke alone records [14] is surprisingly like to that of Jesus (cf. especially, "He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath food, let him do likewise"). The question arises whether after all the picture of John heralding the advent of the greater one who will baptize the nation in fire is not actually that of Jesus heralding the advent of the Son of Man, the final Judge. [15]

My confidence that this suggestion, so far as I know strictly new, is worthy of consideration is heightened by the passage in Josephus which deals with John the Baptist and his untimely demise at the hands of Herod Antipas. Since the passage is of considerable importance, and not over long, it may be well to quote in full in Whiston's archaic rendering:

> Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment of what he did against John, who was called the Baptist; for Herod slew him, who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness toward one another, and piety toward God, and so to come to baptism: for that the washing [with water] would be acceptable to him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away of some sins, but for the purification of the body: supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness. Now when many others came in crowds about him, for they were greatly moved by hearing his words, Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people, might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion (for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise), thought it best by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties, by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late. Accordingly he was sent a prisoner, out of

[14] Luke 3:10-14.

[15] These sentences, "That John the Baptist thus was transformed . . . the final Judge," are taken from an earlier article of mine, already referred to, in the *Journal of Religion*, July, 1929, p. 434, n. 25.

Herod's suspicious temper, to Macherus, the castle I before mentioned, and was there put to death.[16]

In this brief and intelligible account two points are surprising: (1) the reason for John's execution, (2) the entire absence of any mention of what in the Gospels is a highly significant note, the mention of the advent of his greater successor. Personally, I see no need of an elaborate chain of reasoning as to why Josephus, although he mentioned John, was reluctant to mention Jesus. The simplest explanation to me is the perfectly good one that this was not an actual part of John's message. Not that Josephus is exercising editorial privilege with John, but that he is simply recording the facts. Even Josephus may well have done this occasionally. The other element in his account, namely, the reason for Herod's wrath at John, we can reserve for a moment.

On the basis, then, of this critical sifting of the Gospel account and of the testimony of Josephus I am inclined away from the modern conjecture that Jesus was started on his career through contact with John the Baptist, and that he repeated the latter's message even after John's tragic death had sundered the bond of teacher and pupil. Rather I would hazard the guess that the paths of Jesus and John did not cross at all and that our Gospel accounts preserve little or nothing of the actual history of this enigmatic man who is today the fruitful source of all kinds of wondrous speculation, at the present moment, notably Mandean.

Nor would it be overdifficult to see why, if this hypothesis be correct, as the years rolled by, John, although originally quite distinct from Jesus, was gradually brought into the Christian picture, if not into the Christian fold.

There is no more elusive thread in the tangled skein of Christian beginnings than that of Christology. The whole matter is debatable, perhaps insoluble. No scholar has ever

[16] Josephus, *Antiquities*, xviii, 5, 2.

made a suggestion in this field that has received the support of even a tolerable sized minority. To my mind the most difficult phase of this knotty problem is, When did Jesus become recognized as the Jewish Messiah? In my own opinion, not only did he make no such claims for himself, but also others after him failed to make such an identification even after they had come to view him as the supernatural Son of Man of whom he had often spoken, and whose coming they now considered the second coming or return of Jesus. A word such as

> How say the scribes that the Christ is the son of David? David himself said in the Holy Spirit:
>
> The Lord said unto my Lord,
> Sit thou on my right hand,
> Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.
>
> David himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he his son? [17]

can hardly have come from a circle where this claim for Jesus was made.

But eventually that brick was added to the growing edifice. Then it was necessary to provide him with his Elijah; and John the Baptist was ready to hand. Though stated very baldly here, this hypothesis in one form or another is by no means new, and may very possibly contain more than a germ of truth.

There is another possibility which appears to me not improbable. I cannot rid my mind of the impression from the Gospels that after all John the Baptist has been a distinct hindrance to the rise of early Christianity. I have no intention of treading in the thorny paths of Mandean lore—of which I know nothing—nor of overemphasizing his significance. But it appears to me, as to other New Testament interpreters, notably Professor E. F. Scott of Union, that the Fourth Gospel shows a very clear animus against the Baptist's disciples, and has for one of its purposes the complete and voluntary subordination of John to Jesus for the purpose of saying to his fol-

[17] Mark 12: 35-37.

lowers, " Since your leader clearly recognized that our leader was the true Lamb of God, and gladly reckoned himself as but a voice to proclaim him, so you should cease your independent existence, and with us recognize and follow our common Lord." Not alone the reference in Josephus, and the Marcan passage in which Jesus embarrasses his questioners by a query regarding John's baptism, " for all verily held John to be a prophet," [18] which attest the popularity John aroused; but the occasional hints that his movement did not come to an end at the appearance of Jesus, as, for example, " Why do John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not? " [19] would appear to me to justify the assumption that this movement was a distinct liability to the struggling church. Nor is it impossible that the twelve individuals, whom Paul is supposed to have met in Ephesus [20] who knew only the baptism of John and had never even heard of the Holy Spirit, and who accordingly were rebaptized with pleasing results, belonged to this group, still in existence.

If this be the case, might it not well be that the incorporation of John into the Christian picture was a deliberate and studied attempt to vanquish an embarrassing rival? One's acquaintance with the religions of antiquity needs not to be profound to remember numerous examples of a new god gradually supplanting an old and ending up by being recognized as his son. The most effective way of getting rid of a rival is to align him with one's own cause. Accordingly, I find myself in no especial perplexity as to how these stories in the Gospels arose, even though the tangents of Jesus and John never crossed. Once John was in the Christian picture it is not difficult to see how such a legend of Herodias' wrath might have arisen as an explanation of John's untimely end. As we observed, Josephus gives a quite different explanation. And it must be confessed his is a much more plausible one. That

[18] Mark 11: 27-33.
[19] Mark 2: 18.
[20] Acts 19: 1-7.

a Herod should have been very much disturbed by a long-haired wilderness preacher's displeasure at his nuptials is less likely than that he should have trembled with dread at the result of an increasingly popular movement, the burden of which was the collapse of established society. Rulers are not wont to take kindly such proclamations, even though the agent of the collapse be God himself. Herod was probably keen enough to realize John's aims were not political, but at the same time he was canny enough to realize that such a message might well serve as the spark in the powder chest of unrest toward Rome and all her hirelings. Naturally this explanation of John's demise would not prove acceptable to Christians, especially those concerned with establishing the innocency of their movement in the eyes of Rome. How much more probable that John, stanch devotee of pure morals that he was, had perished at the hands of this more formidable modern Jezebel!

To many this line of reasoning will appear subjective and unconvincing; at any rate it is not impossible, and, I may venture to say, it would account for the apparent complete disregard of baptism by Jesus. Yet after all the problem is only shifted. What did bring about the rise of this institution? Have we any clews from the book of Acts?

As we saw at the beginning of this essay, the first appearance of the rite was in the opening pages of the account, namely those retelling the events of Pentecost; but it is almost casually introduced as if it were a long-standing custom. Had it been a feature of the work of Jesus and his disciples, one might perhaps have expected Peter to have urged it as he did, and the people to have received it. But for a new institution to have made its appearance thus would indeed amaze us were we able to rid our minds of the past nineteen hundred years' sway of the sacred rite.

Again, as I hinted earlier, not only is the mention of baptism here unexplained—why did Peter decide on this innovation?—but it seems an alien note. One of the distinguishing

characteristics of these early Jerusalem disciples which apparently helped to differentiate them from their fellow Jews was their belief that from time to time they were especially endowed with the Holy Spirit and thus enabled to do wonderful works. Apparently there was more than one tradition as to how this phenomenon had first appeared. At least two distinct views have been preserved in the New Testament. John 20: 22 has Jesus breathe upon his disciples on the night of the resurrection, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit"; the book of Acts explains it as sent from heaven nearly seven weeks later. But both agree that its ultimate source was Jesus. In one passage [21] it is even called "the Spirit of Jesus."

It can hardly be questioned that the purpose of the Pentecost narrative is not only to explain how this phenomenon occurred, but to attest its reality. It was not a mere state of mind. Actually something happened. The Spirit descended actually; in vivid pictorial language its sweep upon them was as a mighty wind. And due to its appearance, the disciples inspired by its potency exhibited that most customary phase of emotional excitement. All who have read the letters of Paul, especially First Corinthians, will scarcely doubt that glossolalia, or the inarticulate speaking with the tongues of men and angels, was not an unknown feature of early church life. Apparently in this story we can detect its presence. Our author has understood it otherwise. With a sober literalness "speaking with tongues" means to him "speaking in foreign languages," and so he recasts the story from that angle—perhaps thinking that he had here a heavenly foretaste of what would later come to pass, when all men everywhere would once more be united in speech as well as in heart in that bliss which had earlier prevailed only to be destroyed by the sin at the time of the erection of the tower of Babel. At any rate, he altered the story drastically. Many traces of the editor's pencil are clear. One is unmistakable. Some of the unsympathetic

[21] Acts 16: 7.

bystanders scoff, "They are filled with new wine."[22] No one has ever explained that gibe satisfactorily on the grounds that the story presupposes. Each one has heard the words in his own tongue. Why proficiency in a foreign tongue should be ascribed to overindulgence in that which cheereth the heart of man is not clear. But it would be a most natural comment in a situation where in divine intoxication or frenzy men and women talked to God but not to men in syllables such that the unlearned knew not when to say "Amen." Editors may alter narratives, but they usually leave their finger-prints behind! Accordingly, most scholars are agreed that the point of this narrative, in its unaltered form, was to tell how the Spirit actually came—the free gift of Christ from heaven. But this later editorial addition regarding baptism would then be a second and rival explanation, or would at least reveal the way later Christians believed the divine afflatus was received, namely, through baptism. And so we would seem to be on all grounds justified in a confident deletion of this mention of the Christian rite. In passing it may be remarked that in Acts there is another story where the same situation apparently prevails, namely, the account of Cornelius. Upon this pious gentile the spirit first descends; then Peter with ecclesiastical zeal demands baptism. But a discussion of this incident is needless.

A far more probable clew as to the actual rise of this institution is to be seen a few pages on in the account of Acts; namely, in the work of Philip the evangelist. Here we are in the third stage of Christianity's development, if we may for the moment use this convenient anachronism—first Galilee, then Jerusalem, now a gradual spreading out to Samaria and other territory not strictly Jewish. In this part of the narrative we find the situation reversed. Philip baptizes various folk, notably Samaritans and the Ethiopic eunuch; it is not till later that the apostles come down and confer the Spirit. We are not concerned with the historical accuracy—or lack of it

[22] Acts 2: 13.

—of this picture, especially of the improbable representation of the apostles as a college of high officials. But there does seem to me to be more than a germ of truth in the narrative regarding baptism. Here for the first time do we find a real and plausible reason for the appearance of the rite. The disciples of Jesus were good orthodox Jews for some years after the crucifixion. They had curious ideas about Jesus and the speedy culmination of the world's history. They practised, at least for a time, a most dubious financial experiment, which was mercifully brought to a rapid termination by the collapse of the treasury. They had sensational ideas regarding their Spirit-possession, but in all matters of practise they seem to have been zealous sons of Abraham. It is to be noted that no reports of clashes with Pharisees occur in the pages of Acts; no rash words about the Sabbath occur here as in the Gospels. The difficulties in which they finally found themselves involved are apparently of a quite different character. They are considered a nuisance and a menace to law and order. If the speeches recorded in the early pages of Acts at all reflect, as they apparently do, the temper and content of the early Christian message, one wonders not at the clashes when they did come, but at the long-temperedness of those who from their high seats heard reports of what must have seemed to them dangerous millennial nonsense.

As strict Jews, accordingly, they appeared to consider their task to preach this new message to fellow members of their race. As the years went by, however, they found themselves obliged to embrace a wider field; but gradually, and always with trepidation. It may well be that this account of the work of Philip reflects with accuracy this gradual start.

What more natural then that when these Jews began to preach in heathen territory they should have made the customary demands of those who would be their proselytes? It scarcely need be argued that by this time baptism was required by Jews of all who would become proselytes. These Jewish

disciples of Jesus may well have used the formula " in the name of Jesus Christ " to show that it was to a form of Judaism where the claims of Jesus were recognized that they were being bidden.[23]

To my mind, this is a satisfactory and perhaps sufficient explanation of the start of the practise. As the years went by and the movement spread definitely into gentile territory, entered the tideway of Greco-Oriental thought, mighty changes resulted. It would be out of place here even to attempt to sketch the steps which saw the little band of followers of the crucified Nazarene, who had preached the speedy coming of the end of the world, transformed into the cult of the Lord Jesus Christ. But few will doubt that in this process mighty changes took place, none perhaps more spectacular than that with which we are concerned. Is it improbable that in these years of change and development this developing cult should have come to feel the value of an initiatory rite, sacramental if you will, whereby the initiate was plunged into mystic union with the risen Lord, by the impartation of whose spirit a new life began?

This did not happen overnight, but was the result of the gradual recognition that the aims and longings of every human heart were legitimate, that the longings and hopes of all men everywhere could find their satisfaction in him whose mercy was wider than the wideness of the sea. Once established and hallowed by the years, rare indeed would the Christian have been who could have conceived a time when such was not the case. Was it not God's way? God's will has never changed. Only through the blindness of men's hearts has it been necessary for apparent innovations to take place. In reality they are but a call back to the position occupied by men whose eyes were as yet undimmed by sins. So, Jesus, in whom had dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead, could hardly have failed to

[23] Cf. also Foakes-Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. I, pp. 341ff., where a similar explanation is argued.

know and sound these elemental truths. And so, from some such reasoning, from no intention of falsifying, in perfectly natural and spontaneous manner arose these traditions that the Lord had made definite commandment in the most solemn and exalted moment of his life that this practise, all important, should be guarded zealously; nay more, himself, though free from sin or stain, and standing in no need of repentance, the lily of the valley, the fairest of ten thousand of the fair, had for all time hallowed this rite, and showed the way approved by God to fulfil all righteousness.

INDIA'S DILEMMAS

A. S. WOODBURNE

India today is seething with dilemmas. The problems that confront her, the tensions that wrack her are many. There are an amazing number of interpreters of India today, however, both within and without, who are falling a prey to the temptation of oversimplification. Nothing could be more fatuous than the attempt to account for the present unrest by a solitary reference. The well-known scientific principle that causality is usually plural could scarcely find more eloquent testimony than in the present Indian situation. It is not the first time that such efforts have been made. At one time or another the world has been informed that India's problem is social, economic, political, linguistic, racial, moral, or religious. And each suggestion has probably told some of the truth. But the whole truth, which nobody knows, must contain references to every one of these phases of life.

One reason for the present disturbed condition of the India consciousness is the impact of a new way of life, through the contact of her age-old culture with the cultures of other peoples. Improved transportation facilities have brought to her ports myriads of foreign ships, have established within her cities scores of foreign merchants, and have carried to other lands thousands of her aspiring youth. India is sharing with the rest of the world the advantages and the dangers, the blessings and the curses that derive from international contacts. The young Indian who has gone abroad is not the only one to experience a sense of conflict between the traditional Indian views of the world and nature and those of modern science. The British Government has established schools and colleges, and Christian missions have cooperated with Government in an educational system that seeks to impart the best that western education can give. The young India that is in

ferment today is the young India that has been intellectually revolutionized in regard to the great problems of the physical and social sciences. The influence of the Christian missionary has been a further disturbing factor. He has brought with him not only the school which is ever a liberator of thought, but the hospital which is a practical witness to the beneficent possibilities of science, and the new way of life which his gospel inspires. He has gone everywhere—into the village and the jungle, among the untouchables and the primitive hill peoples—and everywhere he has deliberately set out to disturb the consciousness of the people. It is little wonder that these impacts have, to use an Indian form of interpretation, built up *karma*. Today the fruit of these social influences is being reaped.

The drive of the dominant social mind is in the direction of a sharpened national consciousness. For good or for ill, that has resulted in a heightened sense of the value of things Indian. Nothing could be more natural for a people who feel the clash of cultures than to hasten to the defense of their own. Indian philosophy is the most astute that the mind of man has ever attained. The religions of India are as good as any other, and certainly the best for the people of India. The literature of ancient India is incomparably glorious. Such are some of the theses that are being proclaimed with contagious enthusiasm. The ways of life that were good enough for the ancients ought to be good enough for the moderns. Unhappily science and education in many matters point in the opposite direction. Today it seems as though an impasse had been reached. One exceedingly influential group is saying, "Give us the right to work out our own destinies, and all will be well." While cordially admitting the validity of Indian claims to self-expression, politically, socially, or religiously, we should not blind ourselves to the fact that neither Dominion status nor independence nor any other single change is going to prove a panacea for all the ills from which India is suffering.

Let us review some of the most arresting of present-day dilemmas. We may begin with the social. The traditional social structure includes a caste system unparalleled in any other culture. One of its by-products has been the idea that certain groups, through the accident of birth, are untouchable. Educated Indians today, who unfortunately are vastly in the minority, are saying that untouchability must go. Mr. Gandhi and his followers have dealt some telling blows against it. Yet Mr. Gandhi is not prepared to dispense with the caste system. He stresses its advantages by paralleling it with European trade guilds. One cannot but wonder whether it can be expected that untouchability will disappear, if the system that gave it birth is perpetuated. It is a problem that perhaps cannot be solved dogmatically, but one which demands that we pause for reflection.

Another phase of the social dilemma is due to the traditional place that women have occupied in Indian life. Heretofore orthodox groups have denied to women education, political privileges, and most religious privileges. Widows have been denied the right of remarriage, and prepuberty marriages for girls have been the rule, in the dominant castes. Now we are witnessing the emancipation of women, particularly in the cities. Women are being educated and entering the professions. In the present crisis, they are entering the political arena in numbers and influence such as no one would have dreamed, even six months ago. Intercaste marriages, widow remarriages, and postpuberty marriages are steadily on the increase. The social reformers are hopeful that this is a leaven that will eventually pervade the whole social life. Probably it is much too soon to prognosticate how far Indians as a whole are prepared to move. It may be that present-day developments are providing the motive that will release a great emancipating movement that has been gathering strength in the inner convictions of the people.

India is faced today likewise with economic dilemmas. In

her industrial centers she has felt the onward rush toward factory industries, and the better facilities for travel have brought, as elsewhere, a considerable migration to these centers. The big cities have become bigger. The standard of living for some industrial groups has greatly improved. Their expenses are greater, but their wages also much higher. More and more monied Indian gentlemen have been turning to industry for investment, and also for vocations. Over against this movement, a definite reactionary tendency has preached the desirability of maintaining the traditional economic order which is safeguarded by caste. "Back to the spinning-wheel" has been the cry. Cottage industries have been encouraged both by the nationalists and Government departments of industries. To be sure, factory industries are developed sufficiently to provide employment for a very small percentage of the people, and every one recognizes the need for encouraging cottage industries for long years to come. But should that encouragement be accompanied by a free-for-all condemnation of the more highly organized industries that have been coming into existence? Some are ready to condemn them purely on the ground that they originated in the West. Others are free to recognize that the clock cannot be turned back industrially. When Mr. Gandhi lays so much stress on the spinning-wheel, one wonders whether it is for him a symbol, a symbol of nationalism and home effort. Or does he sincerely mean it to represent an economic theory? India stands at the crossing of two economic theories. Perhaps her solution of the problem will be in terms of "both—and" rather than "either—or."

There never was a more fascinating phase of the conflict between science and magic than that which is in progress in India today. India has been the home of magicians for centuries. And she has also had well-developed scientific techniques, such as in astronomy and the medicinal uses of herbs. It is curious how these two theoretically incompatible attitudes have existed side by side. And they still do so. Thousands

of people who go to dispensaries for medical help are wearing charms and amulets. The magician and the medical practitioner are both called upon for help in the same case. Students who are registering for courses in physical science will consult the calendar to guard against paying their fees at tabued times. Educated people in innumerable cases still think more of the findings of the astrologer than anything else in planning for a marriage. The old magical way of living, with its simple credulity in regard to the power of charms and formulas is very slow to yield to more scientific methods of approach. One suspects that some people cherish a sort of grudge against scientific education that has done so much to rob their dear beliefs of validity and their time-honored practises of self-respect. Every educated man knows that magic belongs to the past, and that science holds the key to the future. Slowly, but surely the old tabus are being undermined and the old magical rites are disappearing. But it is a long way that science yet has to travel, before victory is assured.

One reason that the magical way of life is always slow in yielding is that it is so inextricably mixed with religion. That is certainly the situation in India. The mass of India's population belongs to the peasant classes whose religion is a mixture of animism and polytheism with much emphasis on the cults of village godlings. These cults are not purely religious by any means, but afford opportunities for social and recreational activities, and are thoroughly interwoven with magical beliefs and customs. Everywhere the sacrifice is believed to bring results more because it is correctly done than because the gods are won over to a conciliatory frame of mind.

Religion is thoroughly organized in India even as it is in the West, though of course a vastly different system of organization. There are innumerable sects, and families of priests connected with the important temples. These men are jealous of their influence not to mention their incomes. From Vedic times right down to the present, India has had to struggle

against a tyranny of priestcraft. Organized religion always makes the most of its opportunities to strengthen its own position. Yet throughout the religious history of India there have ever been crusading souls who proclaimed heart religion. The emphasis on *bhakti* (loving devotion to a personal deity) in many modern groups is a hopeful sign. It is the struggle for freedom in faith.

Christianity has been present for a long time in India. Its oldest expression—the Syrian church—dates back to the second century. And it has been reenforced largely in the last century by numbers of Protestant and Catholic missionaries. Unhappily it has come to India far too much in the accoutrements of an organized religion. It has failed in the main to separate its message from its organization. Yet all along there has been a consciousness in the minds of the more discerning that the heart of its message was spiritual rather than organic. The interesting thing is that Indians themselves, particularly since the Great War, have learned to discriminate between the church and the religion of Jesus. Tens of thousands of Indians claim to love and revere Jesus, though the church does not attract them. And they go further, claiming that no group of people, not even the church of Christ, can establish a monopoly of Jesus. They even suggest sometimes that they as Orientals are better able to understand and interpret Him than his Western followers. On the whole the Indian acquaintance with Jesus, despite the discrepancies of his Western disciples, has been an appeal to the religion of the spirit. The present-day emphasis on non-violence (*āhimsa*) though it is an ancient Indian ideal, has been repeatedly strengthened by references to the Sermon on the Mount. It is amazing the extent to which Hindu leaders quote the example and teachings of Jesus, as they try to keep alive the spiritual side of their struggle. Doubtless there are some who cannot look at the religion of Jesus dispassionately, since they find his professed followers so often giving the lie to their professions. The arresting fact

is that so many Hindus are able to discriminate between real followers of Jesus and mere professors of the Christian cult, between real religion and organized formalism. It is probably due to the fact that Indians have faced this dilemma for centuries in their own religion. Many of them feel frankly that if India ever becomes Christian, she will do so in spite of organized Christianity, not because of it. A strange spectacle indeed, when a group of men, not seeking any adherence to the religion that takes its name from Jesus, should claim to be more loyal to him than his confessed followers! Obviously this dilemma is one that the Christian church shares with India.

It is perhaps true to say that India has largely resolved the moral dilemma. What is the ethic by which thoughtful Indians judge moral problems today? Many of them are perfectly frank in acknowledging their indebtedness to Christian standards. When behavior that they consider immoral is condemned, it is not because it is unKrishnan or unRaman, but because it is unChristian. The type of moral obligation that they honor is what they find in the character of Jesus. This is in a measure due to the fact that the teaching of ethics in Indian colleges has been that of western ethics that repeatedly owns its indebtedness to the life and teachings of the man of Galilee. But it is also because Indian men and women have come to appreciate the high spirituality they find in Jesus. In him they have recognized some of their own finest moral ideals incarnate —*āhimsa, bhakti,* detachment from the world, inner peace, purity, mercy, and sincerity. The reason that many have resolved the moral dilemma is that they find in the ethics of Jesus an inner harmony with their own best moral thinking.

But there are moral dilemmas not yet resolved. I asked a group of students to make a list of those things in the social world that ought to arouse our moral indignation. Here are some of the things they stressed: race and color prejudice, might overruling right, untouchability, child marriage, the Indian dowry system, ruining others by vice, wanton mischief,

injustice, cruelty, political immorality, and the tyranny of the priesthood. This shows that young India is ready to face the moral dilemmas in the social fabric of the day, and she will increasingly bring courage to their solution.

What can be said about politics? It is trite to say that the vast majority of the intellectuals want a greater measure of self-government. Some define that as self-expression within the Empire, or Dominion status. Some, and they include those who shout the most lustily, define it as independence. If one were to count noses, it is difficult to say which group would be in the ascendant. In any case what they demand is the right to learn by experience. Has not Britain learned the greatest lessons of her political history by the process of "muddling through"? Why should not India learn the same way? Sometimes they are reminded that they have a much more equitable and probably more democratic government than they would have if they governed themselves. They even point to Afghanistan, torn asunder by inner strife, sometimes ruled with rank injustice, and with all its crudeness they envy the Afghans.

It is a curious coincidence that the present outbreak of unrest should come at a time when India has one of the most sympathetic viceroys ever placed in the country, and the Labor Government in Britain is more sympathetic with Indian aspirations than any previous government. That is precisely what causes the dilemma. A very prominent Indian told me that what the nationalist is most afraid of is a popular viceroy or a sympathetic British government. He is afraid that such sympathy and popularity will cut the nerve of his propaganda.

It can scarcely be stressed too much that the present movement is a complex of all these factors, social, economic, religious, moral, and political. To all of which we must add the fact that India is more like a continent than a nation. She has a huge population of peoples speaking a large number of languages, belonging to a variety of races, adhering to different religions. There is probably a greater sense of national unity

today, despite foreign occupation, than ever in her history. That fact she owes to the language of her conquerors which is the *lingua franca* of all educated Indians, and to the system of education which the British have not hesitated to encourage, though they knew full well it must bear the fruits that we are witnessing today. Why not be perfectly honest and recognize the complexity of the situation, and the impossibility of solving the problem by any short-cut methods?

The struggle of the present is not new. It is, in one sense, the inveterate conflict between two philosophies of life, the material and the spiritual. India has enjoyed a remarkable reputation for her emphasis on the things of the spirit, and, be it said to her glory, she has always had great souls who have kept alive the fires of her spiritual idealism. She still has them. It is much too simple an explanation, however, to blame the materialism of the present on the impact of the West. Prof. W. E. Clark showed in his presidential address before the American Oriental Society in 1926 that "Indian civilization has always been controlled by precisely the same combination of forces that has controlled western civilizations or any other civilizations in the world." In a land where there is always famine somewhere, where myriads of people have so little of the means of sustaining life, it could not be otherwise. Material interests are human interests. Indians need food, clothing, and shelter, and enjoy the comforts of life as well as anybody. Indians have proved themselves capable of technical and scientific achievement, as well as religious. The struggle is as old as in Vedic times. It has broken out again because of the complex arising from present-day contacts of culture.

Human nature is not vastly different in different parts of the world. Here the emphasis may be in one direction; in India it may be in another. One age may stress one point; another age puts the stress on another. Indians are human beings, with longings and aspiration, interests and ideals which are the product of their peculiar social situation. They love

and they hate like other men. In India there are millions who are ready to judge a man for what he is worth and who recognize and respond whole-heartedly to every gesture of friendship. India has a wealth of intelligence and idealism which she is increasingly willing to share with the world. She will probably never again seek for any social or spiritual isolation. And there are elements of grace and beauty in her culture to participate in which will make the West richer and better.

THE POETRY OF THE GOSPELS

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Among the paladins of Charlemagne was the adventurous Astolpho. Arriving in Abyssinia, he was carried to the top of a great mountain that towered high above the surrounding plain. There he was met by St. John, Enoch, and Elijah. These three holy inhabitants of what proved to be a terrestrial paradise, conveyed him to the moon. He was shown a collection of bottles, tightly sealed to prevent the evaporation of the very volatile liquid they contained. It was explained to him that the bottles contained the unused common-sense of men. Each bottle bore a label, and Astolpho was more than a little surprised to see that many of his friends who passed among men as wise, really had used but a small portion of their common-sense. Some had lost their reason by yielding to the sway of passions; some in braving tempests and shoals in search of wealth; some by trusting too much to the promises of the great; some by setting their hearts on trifles.

"As might be expected," says the teller of the story,[1] "the bottles which held the common-sense of the poets were in general the best filled of all!"

Shakespeare pokes sly fun at this conception when he has Theseus say,[2]

> The lunatic, the lover and the poet
> Are of imagination all compact;
> . . . . . .
> . . . The poet's pen
> . . . gives to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name.

It would seem to be quite unnecessary to point out the utter uselessness of a search for poetry in the Gospels if this

[1] Bulfinch, *Mythology*, p. 769ff.
[2] *Midsummer Night's Dream*, V, i, 10-17.

be our conception of its nature. We may assume a higher level of appreciation.

We may assume, also, that no one will search for rhyme or metrically arranged verses. These are not Poetry, but only the forms used to express some kinds of writing. Poetry is a spiritual experience for the enjoyment of which too many of us need a dependable collyrium for our literary myopia!

Poetry is not the sentimental trifles indulged in by the erotic mind; yet many forget that Erato was only one of the Muses. Neither is it the effusive babblings of the esthete, nor the doggerel and macaronics of a clever and ingenious linguistic philanderer. One does not write a poem by paying attention to meter, rhyme, stanza, and verse, or by observing with meticulous concern the patterns of the "great poets." Poetry is neither the poem nor the poet. It is not even the combination of the two.

Poetry is a way of looking at life. Indeed, it may very well be a way of living life! It is our response to what comes to us through our senses, through our meditations, through our intuitions. It is our experience of truth. Poetry is the sense we have that we are in the presence of reality, that we see not merely a concrete object but an abstract principle, not merely an individual perception but a general conception. Poetry is our contact with what we recognize and identify as the essence of the cosmos. It is not confined within its manifestation, but only localized there; it is not exhausted when we have discovered it, but rather released from the specific into the generic. Poetry is the discovery of the eternal in time.

Such a discovery, according to its intensity, may leave us mildly enthused or aghast at the incurred responsibility. For an experience of poetry is incomplete without some expression, usually literary. This personal recreation of an original experience completes the circle of poetry. It is the touchstone of our appreciation. Poetry, when written, is always to be read aloud. No one has ever really read a poem until he has read

it with his voice and listened to it with his ears. It must sing itself in pleasurable and satisfying sounds. "Poetry is simply the sharing of life in patterns of rhythmical words." [3]

Let me illustrate. We are walking in a monastery garden. We have paused before a life-size bronze Crucifix, and our attention is attracted to a spider's web spun across the eyes of the Divine Figure. How do you respond to that experience? Listen to what a poet said of it.[4]

A weary crawl
  Until she found a home.
There seemed a call
  Indeed that bade her come
And search the Cross.
  Why not another tree
With less of loss
  In time and certainty?
Its bark was rough:
  Why must she climb so high?
Not far enough
  From earth, nor yet near sky?
She reached the Feet;
  They did not give her rest.
No lodging meet
  She found upon the Breast.
Closed lips! But Eyes
  Were opened! Glad surprise!
The Pupils, sculptured wells
  Of safety, peace,
For her were holy cells
  Of refuge—Cease
My Soul, and here abide,
  Where spiders hide,
And Peter found the solvent for his pride!

That, I believe, is an excellent illustration of true poetry —the experience of truth and beauty translated into language

[3] Margaret Wilkinson, *New Voices*, p. 7.
[4] Herbert Seymour Hastings, *The Spider*.

that is true and beautiful. We feel the charm and reality. We hear it as a dim remembrance of our own heart. As we hear the words we know why Cyrano de Bergerac said,[5]

> When I have made a line that sings itself
> So that I love the sound of it—I pay
> Myself a hundred times.

Poetry comes to us in good taste, clothed appropriately in the habiliments of a friend. He displays a beauty of language, rhythm, imagery, and emotion. His words are words of truth. This is the friend for whom we look in the Gospels.

The Poetry of the King James Version

The story of the King James Bible is too well known to need recounting here. It was dependent for the most part upon Tyndale's translation, in its turn a unique phenomenon which Laura Wild says[6] " was the lens which caught and focused all the rays from many sources."

In addition there were Wyclif, Coverdale, sonorous Latinisms, concrete, vivid, and figurative Hebrew. All this was the

> rich ore which was cast into the English crucible to be heated hot with religious fervor and with the zest of a new intellectual awakening, a new freedom of the individual, a new national loyalty. Out of the fire came this book, so simple, direct, and suggestive in language, so beautiful and resonant in rhythm, so majestic and inspiring in tone that as literature it is said even to surpass the original, and no one influence has been so great in the life of the English-speaking people, religiously, morally, socially, politically, as has this version.

The language of our King James Bible, on page after page, is the most exquisite poetry, couched in the linguistic beauty of the Elizabethan age. Free verse, so boastfully a form of modern poetry, is frequently found throughout the Gospels.

[5] Edmund Rostand, *Cyrano de Bergerac*, Act 2.
[6] Laura Wild, *Romance of the English Bible*, p. 56.

Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? (Matt. 6:30.)

The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head (Matt. 8:20).

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! (Matt. 23:37.)

Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light (Matt. 11:28-30).

No wonder these verses have sung their way into, and been cherished by the memory of countless souls who have discovered in them the beauty of poetic utterance. We read them aloud and are immediately aware of the ease of their articulation and the harmony of their sounds. We love to repeat them. Modern translations do not satisfy. Again and again we find ourselves turning to the King James Version for the words that endear themselves to us with the beauty and rhythm of their perfect poetry.

May I at this point dismiss with very brief reference the matter of parallelism as found in the Gospels? This form of Hebrew poetry is quite familiar to all of us; as, I believe, are also the attempts to reduce the Lord's Prayer to an original Aramaic metrical form.[7] Examples of this form of poetry occur to us quite readily, and we need not be detained by illustration or further comment.

The Poetry of Jesus

But the Gospels have much more poetry in them than is to be found either in the poetic presentation of the King James Version—impressive as that is, or in evidences of Hebrew

[7] "A Possible Metrical Original of the Lord's Prayer," by C. C. Torrey. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1913, pp. 312-317.

parallelism. The real poetry one finds to be in the material presented; i. e., in the view of life so solicitously expressed by Jesus.

Let me at this point clearly say that I am making no distinction between the actual historical Jesus, who, I fear, must remain rather shadowy, and the Jesus presented by the Gospel narratives. Whatever may be the differences presented by each evangel when compared with the others, of this one similarity I feel sure: The Jesus of the Gospels is a poet! This I hope to show.

Such a literary character I feel is the product of an original who was a poet and of his biographers, who were also poets. The evangelists' picture of Jesus is so poetic that it demands these two elements for its production. Consequently, when in this paper I say, "Jesus said," I am meaning, "It is recorded of Jesus that he said." The acceptance of this literary brevity will avoid repeated periphrasis.

We have said that poetry is a view of life, a seeing of life whole. It is the beautiful expression of truth, frequently seen in the conciseness of a symbol. It is living with the rhythms of life.

Let me proceed again by illustration. I shall quote a portion of an article on "The Spirit of Japanese Poetry," by Ken Nakazawa, that appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* for February, 1929.

> The Japanese poem is the dewdrop that holds the rainbow in its heart. In order to enjoy it, one must take the rainbow out of the dewdrop and spread it across the firmament. . .
>
> In the sound of a temple bell,
> I hear the loneliness of a thousand years.
>
> An old bell hangs in a weather-stained belltower. Long yellow grass tangles on the roof of the belltower; thousands of ivy vines hide its pillars, and deep moss covers its decaying steps. From the eaves of this ancient tower swings the huge bronze bell, green with a great age, a dragon coiled at its crest.

An old priest comes to the tower. His tall emaciated body is clad in a long black robe, and his lean fingers are bent over a brown rosary. As he slowly ascends the mossy steps, he seems to be the soul of the evening shadows, which are fast gathering.

Standing beside the great bell, he prays awhile, rolling the rosary between his palms and mumbling sacred words. Then he swings back the huge hammer, which hangs against the bell, and strikes.

Out of the great bell comes a deep, mellow sound, spreading over the temple yard and the city beyond. There is an indescribable feeling of loneliness in that sound. It makes one think of the soul that must leave its earthly confinement and lose itself in the vastness of the Great Beyond. It calls forth the vision of the people who have heard it in the days that are no more: millions and millions of men who stood on the long, long road of yesterdays, listening, praying, and then passing away.

> In the sound of a temple bell,
> I heard the loneliness of a thousand years.

If we can see the eternal truth expressed in this brief statement and can feel the beauty of it, and can say, "That is poetry!" let us turn to the Gospels for the poetry of Jesus.

Jesus repeatedly makes use of short descriptions that are surcharged with color. He seems to have grasped the whole meaning of an experience and to have crowded a lifetime of comment into a brief pregnant phrase. This, we have said, is poetry. We labor our point in prose, we sing our melody in poetry. In that song is all the freedom of beauty released from the restraint of effort. "If poetry come not naturally as the leaves of a tree, it had better not come at all," said Keats in his famous definitions of poetry.

Jesus was not a schoolmaster with carefully framed philosophical definitions, for he knew that truth can never be imprisoned in a pedant's cage of stilted words. He threw away the schoolman's stylus and grasped the artist's brush. Of Jesus might be said what Helen Keller wrote of Lindbergh, "In the world's market where they sell all things, he had bought a dream."

How difficult it is to share a dream with belligerent

sophists and clever casuists. Yet, in spite of that difficulty, Jesus spoke his dream in terms of poetry—the only way a dream can be preserved. He saw the need of bringing men to a realization of themselves as children of God, a need of which they seemed to be quite unaware. They must be brought to that truth by the skilful use of love. But what can Galilean fishermen know of these subtleties?

Jesus said, "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men" (Matt. 4: 19).

In the pursuit of his dream for men he experienced the supreme elation of faith—the vision of a justified confidence in God. He already saw the end of all struggles against evil, an end illumined by the conquest of an almost personal spirit of malignant cunning. How often the way of the flesh had showed a devilish ingenuity. But the end of all this was in sight! The disciples might well rejoice in their immediate successes over specific sins and difficulties, but as for Jesus, he could assure them of the ultimate victory of the Kingdom of God.

Jesus said, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven" (Luke 10: 18).

What Jesus spoke in the beauty of poetry, we have heard as the dullest prose, and our inflexible insistence upon a dogmatic literalism has been dissatisfied with less than a Lucifer catapulted from the skies!

Illustrations of this poetry of Jesus are numerous:

Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set upon a hill cannot be hid (Matt. 5: 14).

What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken by the wind? (Matt. 11: 7.)

Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves (Matt. 10: 16).

Wheresoever the body is, thither will vultures be gathered together (Luke 17: 37b).

But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted and were scattered abroad as sheep having no

shepherd. Then said he unto his disciples, " The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few " (Matt. 9 : 36-37).

Will it help us to see the poetry of this last selection if we place beside it the expression of the same thought by a modern poet? [8]

> Let not young souls be smothered out before
> They do quaint deeds and fully flaunt their pride.
> It is the world's one crime its babes grow dull,
> Its poor are oxlike, limp and leaden-eyed.
> Not that they starve, but starve so dreamlessly,
> Not that they sow, but that they seldom reap,
> Not that they serve, but have no gods to serve,
> Not that they die, but that they die like sheep.

Furthermore, Jesus frequently used the literary form known as hyperbole; i. e., the fanciful, overemphatic, and picturesque use of the imagination to produce a statement so obviously an exaggeration that only the most literally-minded could possibly understand it otherwise.

Such, for example, are the following:

If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not thy whole body should be cast into hell (Matt. 5 : 29).

But I say unto you that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also (Matt. 5 : 39).

Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God? But even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows (Luke 12 : 6, 7).

If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and his mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple (Luke 14 : 26).

How persistently we have denied to Jesus this form of poetry. How clumsily we have fallen into a ruthless requirement of precision in diction, covering our own obtuseness by

[8] Vachel Lindsay, *The Leaden Eyed.*

asking others to "say what they mean." They have said exactly what they meant; it is we who have failed to understand. We have had pearls scattered before us and we have trampled them under foot. And who will say that many of us have not also turned to rend the Giver? Well has Doctor Vedder said,[9] "*and so exegetes have made hay of his delicate flowers and fresh grass.*"

What are the parables but the most remarkable poems? Read them again for their depth of beauty as well as for their truth. See them not merely as "Christ's feathered arrows" but hear them as "the echoing footfalls of the seeking Shepherd." The poet does not see life philosophically, nor dogmatically. His message comes in pictures.

Thus, Jesus did not attempt to explain the relation of the God of power to the God of love—he told the story of The Prodigal Son. Instead of arguing the problem of the God of justice and the God of mercy, he gave utterance to the parabolic sentence, God "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust" (Matt. 5:45).

On several occasions when men came to him with questions and problems, instead of attempting the unpoetic solution of the theologian, Jesus "spoke a parable unto them." In this manner he spoke the unparalleled poems on Forgiveness (Matt. 18:23), The Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30), The Rich Fool (Luke 12:16).

Sometimes we hear Jesus ask again after one of his poems, "Have ye understood all these things?" and the answer comes, as of old, "Yea, Lord!" A consideration of the original occasion of that question (Matt. 13:51) causes us to feel that it was asked in good-humored tolerance and awareness of the human tendency to hide its obtuseness by profession which seemed the more elegant. Is the same answer today given for the same reason?

[9] Henry C. Vedder, *Fundamentals of Christianity*, p. 13.

We forget his intense dislike of shallow and uncomprehending allegiance. We forget his stern denunciation of one who believed she was expressing poetry when she was merely becoming sentimental:

A certain woman of the company lifted up her voice and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the breasts which thou hast sucked. But he said, Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it! (Luke 11:27, 28.)

There is a difference between that which is merely pretty and that which is beautiful; between the attractive and the inspiring!

The disciples frequently misunderstood the poetry of Jesus. It was not so much that they were in disagreement with his teachings, but rather that they failed to recognize their own heart's desire in the poetic presentation of it given by the Master. His actual words they repudiated; his poetry they handled so clumsily that it fell from their grasp and was shattered into pieces on the hard earth they trod.

He said, "He that hath no sword let him sell his garments and buy one."

And they said, "Lord, behold, here are two swords."

And he said, "It is enough!" (Luke 22:38ff.)

He said, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the Sadducees."

And they said, "It is because we have taken no bread" (Matt. 16:6, 7).

He said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God."

And they were exceedingly amazed and said, "Who then can be saved?"

And Jesus looked at them and said, "With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible" (Matt. 19:24-26).

And I wonder how many have caught the irony of His words?

If we deny poetry in the words of Jesus how else are we to read and appreciate such thoughts as:

For if they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry? (Luke 23:31.)

I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger (John 6:35).

But many that are first shall be last; and the last shall be first (Matt. 19:30).

And Jesus said unto him, "Verily I say unto thee, Today thou shalt be with me in paradise" (Luke 23:43).

Indeed, the Gospels are so impregnated with poetry that there is an occasional bit of evidence that it has crept in unconsciously. The author of a story uses a phrase which cannot quite convince us that it is wholly a prose utterance of an historical fact. In the following illustrations, such a phrase is put into italics.

He then having received the sop, went immediately out; *and it was night* (John 13:30).

Now on the first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, *while it was yet dark* (John 20:1).

The officers sent to take Jesus have been unsuccessful. There are on the scene these officers, the chief priests, the Pharisees, and Nicodemus. After a question by the officers, the Evangelist closes the incident with the significant phrase, *"And every man went into his own house"* (John 7:53).

It will be observed that these quotations are all from the Fourth Gospel. Is it presumptuous to say that the whole Gospel is a poem? Or a series of short poems? For myself, I would go even further and say that while Jesus himself was the greatest religious poet the world has ever known, the entire story of his life as told in our Gospels is the greatest religious poem the world has ever known. The dulness of our preaching is the dulness of prose! He spoke in the beauty of poetry and "the common people heard him gladly." The uninteresting sermons we preach about Jesus are the historical homilies of a Galilean Teacher. The Gospel pictures of Jesus are the flashes

of poetic intuition that stimulate us like a fresh salt breeze from the ocean blowing through a heavily perfumed room.

A poetic preaching of Jesus will avoid the criticism of George Coe in his *What is Christian Education?*

> Most preaching at present raps like a peddler at the door of persons who have no purchases to make (p. 222).

Times without number we seem to catch the picture of a poet whose words and rhythms are sung to no appreciative ear, whose imaginative beauty is seen by no understanding eye, whose free spirit is known to no sensitive soul.

The healing and regeneration of His words are in their cleansing purity and refreshing beauty; but we insist upon submitting them to the most rigorous examination. Often an intense zeal to preserve theological and even religious integrity has resulted in a spiritual mendacity of which we are utterly unaware. In attempting to interpret the sayings of Jesus we have promulgated a good deal of technical nonsense and spurious scholarship. Frequently we have been only amusing pedants, delighted with the abracadabra of our criticism. We might be pictured as literary Lilliputians tying down this poetic Gulliver with our prose threads and practical stakes, and then joining hands as we dance in holy exultation about our capture!

A poet lived in Galilee
  Whose mother dearly knew him,
And his beauty like a cooling tree
  Drew many people to him.

He loved the speech of simple men
  And little children's laughter;
He came, they always came again,
  He went—they followed after.

He had sweet-hearted things to say,
  And he was solemn only
When people were unkind that day;
  He'd stand there straight and lonely

And tell them what they ought to do;
"Love other folk," he pleaded,
"As you love me and I love you!"
But almost no one heeded.

A poet died in Galilee,
They stared at him and slew him . . .
What would they do to you and me
If we should say we knew him?[10]

O Jesus, Thou Son of Man, our hearts yearn for Thee! Within us there is a wistfulness that, ere we know it, turns to a restlessness. We fear we have lost Thee.

Thou hast been too near to us for our far-wandering eyes to behold Thee. Thy words are so like to sounds that come to us in the clear-running brooks and the songs of birds that our ears have been dulled to them.

We thought of Thee as a Teacher; Thou hast been a Companion. While we sought for a God of glory and splendor and majesty, Thou hast remained unobserved as a Man of Sorrows, acquainted with grief. We have raised our prayer for power and for place. The power Thou hast given us is the power to restrain and discipline, while the place of those who follow Thee is as the place of those who serve.

Our world has become a world of things and of men. Thou didst live to make it a world of spirit and of sons of God. Have we lost Thee?

Do Thou roll back the curtain that divides us from Thee —the curtain of many folds. Do Thou dissolve the mists that obscure our vision. Reveal to our yearning hearts Thy great heart—broken upon the altar for human wanderings.

O Jesus, Thou Galilean Poet, come back to us!

[10] Witter Bynner, *The Poet.*

WHO'S WHO IN THIS ISSUE

Again we are favored with a paper by Professor Gaius Glenn Atkins, of Auburn Theological Seminary, whose most recent book *The Procession of the Gods* is reviewed in this number, and was chosen by "The Book of the Month Club" for its superior value, and marked for special commendation to readers. Doctor Atkins has written on a subject suggested by the editor, whose reiterated request brought from the author "You are a patient and persistent petitioner. There is a parable in the New Testament which presents you." To which the editor could only reply: "I may be the importunate widow, but you are not the unjust judge, but like Him whom the parable presents by contrast—the gracious Father in Heaven." The paper came.

We do not often solicit or accept papers that represent one side of a controversy when reply by the protagonist is not to be presented. We, however, asked for and gladly present the article by Douglas Clyde Macintosh, Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale College of Religion, because certain writers of theology have challenged the right of those who do not accept certain doctrines to call themselves Christian. Professor Macintosh offers the effective reply to this challenge. His writings have appeared on our pages on other occasions, and his books have made him known to our readers.

Professor Charles Luther Williams, Emeritus in English Literature in Denison University, offers a study, in his usual picturesque style, of the practical value of Shakespeare to the life and work of the preacher. There is practical value as well as pleasant humor in this paper.

Professor Stewart G. Cole, of the Crozer Faculty, recently returned from his sabbatical year of study abroad, presents one of the most significant questions that can be asked of those who hold liberal views concerning the Bible. The question is peculiarly significant to liberal scholars in America, viz., "What is the right religion attitude to the Bible in view of the work of historical and literary criticism?" The question requires, in all sincerity, a frank answer. If the situation he presents is correctly reported, and if it is openly faced, the answer cannot well be withheld.

Doctor Enslin's paper "Some Further Considerations Regarding the Origin of Christian Baptism," will be of interest whether one gives assent or dissent. It must be noticed that the article has to do not with the doctrine of immersion, but with Christian Baptism in general, and will therefore apply to the whole ordinance or sacrament as men may regard it. We bespeak a hospitable reading for the paper.

For many years resident in India, and eminently fitted to write concerning the problem of that vast country, Professor A. S. Woodburne, of Crozer, presents in a brief paper what he believes to be the main elements in the present situation in India. He judges there are many factors in the problem. His views should command attention.

Robert E. Keighton, minister of The Baptist Church of the Evangel, at Narberth, Pa., and instructor in Crozer Seminary, is known among many as deeply interested in the subject of his paper, in some degree because of his temperament, as well as because of his study. He has a wide acquaintance with contemporary poetry.

EDITOR'S NOTES

SPENSER B. MEESER

THE AIM OF THE CROZER QUARTERLY

If the reader will consult the front-page announcement, he will see that from its inception The Quarterly does not aim at propaganda, and seeks neither to present nor to propagate a dogmatic. If it so proposed, the question "Whose propaganda?" would at once present itself. Baptists represent wide divergences of view, and often something like the far extremes in theology, Calvinistic and Arminian, not to mention in detail many other such oppositions of view. Nevertheless we have maintained our integrity and continuity, due to the fact that our basis of union is not creedal; nor did it ever consist in theological agreement, as witness the General and Particular Baptists in Great Britain, a distinction still maintained there even in their present happy unity.

The views presented here in The Quarterly, therefore, do not represent any propaganda, or any agreement on the part of the contributors to advocate a common faith. The articles contributed are not to be taken as representing the opinions or beliefs of any save the writers of the articles themselves. This is true also of those theses presented by the members of The Faculty of the Seminary, and the notes of The Managing Editor. We aim to inform our readers as to current discussions and new views on long-debated questions, to arouse interest and vigorous thinking on the different aspects of morals and religion, to quicken assent or dissent to views that are being advocated even in our own pages, and to inspire confidence in the basis of Christian unity which may be found in a common experience of the soul with God as revealed in many lives, preeminently in Christ.

Even the most conservative, he who believes in a faith

once for all delivered to the saints, if he wishes to give a reason for the faith in him, must know what other faiths may teach in order intelligently either to reject those faiths or rationally to justify his own faith. The Editor in accepting a paper submitted, or in soliciting a paper, does not thereby assent to the theses presented; he simply inquires whether these papers are well and interestingly written and present ideas worthy of consideration, or reconsideration in the light of new facts and experiences, so that they come with fresh and invigorating power. In other words we aim to be a journal of discussion, to inspire and encourage freedom in thinking and in interpretation. We solicit contributions from those we believe can think freely, untrammeled by the past even while reverent toward it, and who can write as, in some worthy sense, specialists.

We do not suppose that our readers, moreover, however convinced they may be that they have true views, will claim or even think that they have the whole truth, or will clamor for assurance that there is no more beyond. We do not offer them therefore as a reiteration of age-long shibboleths, nor think of them as proposing to hide their heads, ostrichlike, in the sands of obscurantism. We mean to honor them by treating them intellectually as men. We do not ask subscription to *all* the doctrines here presented. Who could do so would have to do so without understanding or rather without thinking. We do not address our readers as of the thirteen-year-old mental caliber, but as those of maturing mind; and we offer these suggestions not as an apology but as an explanation.

DO WE NEED A NEW SCIENCE?

This is a question seldom asked, and if asked would at once be answered, "We have it." We have a new science, new with the twentieth century as compared with the nineteenth, and newer still in this third decade of the twentieth

century as compared with the second or first decade of the century. There is always a new science. Science is never static, it is always genetic, becoming, because new factors are being recognized by the living interest of the human mind; and the mind's impulsion to square its ideas and theories with the emerging factors runs to organized truth.

But science remains in spirit, purpose, and nature the same. No one thinks himself untrue to science or its enemy because he finds new facts or alters his conclusions and generalizations to fit and include the facts discovered. He deals with a changing world as well as recognizes that his knowledge of it is but partial at best. If his subject-matter were fixed and finished materials, all known, and their ordered ways understood, he could offer a perfect and finished product. Since it is otherwise, no one in his intelligent moments demands a definitely complete and infallible science.

The more frequent questions are: Do we need a new religion? Do we need a new theology? Here also the answer is immediately given—We have them, a new theology because, in the broad sense, we have new religion, fresh with every increase in the complexity of life and man's deeper, more comprehensive knowledge of himself, his relations to his fellows, and his concepts of the character and nature of God. Religion may be defined too narrowly and should, in our thought, include more than the particular impressions, aspirations, and inspirations, with their consequent rituals and responses which for any individual or group have constituted religion. The study of the world's religions should teach us something, and add to our spiritual capital some increments of exceeding value. The alive spirit will want to adjust himself to all recognized values and give heed to every prophetic insight.

So without reversal of purpose or spiritual intent, one may find his religion enriched in content and thus new in outlook and inclusiveness. In thus being open-minded and open-

souled he should not think of himself as disloyal to religion. He follows the lead of the Light and seeks to live in the Light. That is the abiding attitude which gives continuity to religion.

The more significant question, not so easily answered, is something like this, "Is the new religion, and with it the new theology, any better than the old?" Which inevitably raises the query, "What does one mean by 'better'?"

Religion was made for man, not man for religion; so we might paraphrase a saying of Jesus. The good of man (the obverse of the glory of God) is necessarily then the measure of the good, better, best, in religion and morals. Well then, is the new religion better than the old in the sense that it is better fitted to the facts of this and any further life we can conceive, more in harmony with a right world-view? Is it better in the sense that it is more nearly fit to function in this twentieth-century life of mankind to the end of man's highest good? Or, more central and inclusive, Is it better adapted to create or awaken, develop, magnify, and conserve noble personality in man?

These may be seen to be the tests of whether "the new religion" and its theoretic justification in "the new theology" is still "religion," and better than the old, as science is still science in all its aspects of change. Of course we cannot overlook the fact that religion represents for multitudes the element of permanence and continuity in this otherwise changing, fateful world; and to introduce the factor of change into religion cannot appear to them as for the better, but inevitably for the worse. Here is that which, as they conceive it, came perfect from the will of God. Improvement is impossible; so that any change means regress and loss. But here are the facts! Is religion then built on illusion? May we not believe that, although much that poses as "new religion" is spiritual blindness and moral decay, God is still sending out his light and truth to lead us?

AS TO THE NATURE OF RELIGION

NEITHER morals nor religion can function in an intellectual vacuum. Perhaps it were better to say that the human soul cannot function morally or religiously in an intellectual vacuum. For it is becoming reasonably clear that religion is a functioning activity of the whole personality, and that the popular liberal (!) resentment to dogma (doctrine, ideas to be lived by, teaching) is unintelligent or worse, irrational, and is often made the justification for exorcising an old for a new dogma. We should not fool ourselves to think we can long rationally be either moral or religious without a body of correlated beliefs, or that it makes little or no difference what we believe.

We are "endowed with intellect" is one way of thinking of it; but the better way is to think "we *are* intellect," mind, will, heart; and religion is neither of these exclusively nor primarily. Religion is the whole personality of man in reaction to the initial activity of God in and upon him. Religion therefore is more than, indeed other than, assent to a belief, or system of doctrines. In no sense can religion function simply as belief, while, on the other hand, religion may be suffocated in an atmosphere of many doctrines. "Man" acts in every activity. It is *he* thinks, he feels, he acts; not his mind, heart or will.

The implications of this, by no means novel view, are, however, often either not appreciated or are wholly ignored. On the one hand it should be seen that the discrediting of doctrine has been overdone and run its course. As evidence of this let it be noted that the first thing any order of life offered by those who reject the moral and religious order, the first thing sought is an intellectual content for that order, both as a rational justification of the substitution of an alternative order, and as a rationale of that particular way of life. That is simply to say that any way of life must satisfy the reason

as well as the heart. The reasons religion and morals offer for the generally accepted way may be inconclusive to some thinkers, may need revision or correction, may even need to be rejected. But to reject these does not mean that either religion or morals can continue as activities of man in an intellectual vacuum. Man is a rational being endowed with moral reason and rational will and can be normal in his way of life only as he acts rationally; and this is as true in his moral and spiritual life as in any other aspect of it.

But this is equally true of the other aspects of man's personality. Religion alive, "in action," that is, really functioning, involves the whole man. The editor is hoping that in a later (perhaps April) issue he may be able to present a series of papers offered by the faculty in philosophy at Swarthmore College in which the places of conduct, belief, and feeling in religion are ably presented and offer the data upon which a normative definition of religion might be based. This done, a distinction of great value may be made between religion and some other psychological reactions which are often confused with religion, such as the æsthetic response to the appeal through the senses of form and color. Of this more later.

THE SUBSTITUTES FOR RELIGION

The alternatives to religion as it is conceived and lived by the many of us, suggest (we speak humbly) the intellectual poverty of "the modern," his paucity of ideas, and, in particular, either his ignorance of, or contempt for, the history of theological and philosophical doctrine.

A patient review of these novel (!) propositions by one with even an imperfect knowledge of the past history of ideas, often reveals not novelty, but recrudescence, not creativity but thinly disguised imitation, not progress in ideas but only repetition. Their forms, cultures, and rituals are revivals of what history shows the race heard, tried, and abandoned;

and this is true all the way down from frank atheism to humanism, with all the poorly simulated plots, plans, and philosophies in between. This is not to say that the simulation was conscious, that men have sought to palm off as original what was plagiarized, or as new and worth while what we knew had been tried, found wanting, and rejected. No! that is the point: the plagiarism is unwitting as is the ignorance or contempt. But it is here lies the trouble. History is not an infallible teacher perhaps, but is an important one, and cannot well be held in contempt or wisely ignored. But only ignorance or contempt can explain the neglect of the lessons of history.

Neither is the observation to be thought of as denying that there is any value added to our present understanding of life's problems by recurrence to these ideas. Materialistic atomism, for instance, that of Democritus, had its revival, with revisions, in modern science, where its quantitative measures were accepted as sufficient explanation of qualitative differences, and made a useful instrument in practical science. This atomism was rejected by Plato and Aristotle, and revived only by Epicurus as the metaphysics of Epicureanism; and by modern Hedonists for a like philosophy of life. Now most recent science has rejected this materialistic atomism, while the philosophers of pleasure continue to think in it their "way" is scientifically grounded.

The new values of life and the meanings of the universe, as most recent science sees them, have grounding in something beyond matter, but many "moderns" do not follow this new lead of science. Condemning those who do not follow their own lead they remain obdurate in their reiteration of an abandoned theory. We sometimes call such a condition a conflict of opinion though it is difficult to believe, one finds, that there is not also some conflict of feeling and will—a will to believe, or, as has been pointed out, there may be a will to disbelieve. Faith may be ofttimes uncritical, but who will deny

that there may be uncritical doubt also. One may be resistant to the authority of the past in its contribution to faith, but equally to its denials. Denying the authority, and in some instances even the values, of earlier philosophers and their affirmations, there are those who assume the same authority for themselves and their asservations. It is indeed a poor rule that will not work both ways, and some thinkers may exercise the same critical attitude to these moderns which they employ toward the ancient and maintain at the same time intellectual self-respect and rationality.

BOOK REVIEWS

Preparing the Way for Paul: The Proselyte Movement in Later Judaism. Frederick Milton Derwacter. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 165. Price, $1.75.

Here is an excellent book. And it fills a long-felt want. Too often Christian apologists have failed to recognize the debt their religion owes to the one from which it emerged. The very fact that Christianity was —to quote Doctor Derwacter's happy phrase—" an anti-Jewish Judaism " has helped to obscure this fact which should be self-evident.

Doctor Derwacter has not attempted a study of early Christianity. In fact the title of the book is almost misleading. His one purpose has been a study of the proselyte movement in later Judaism; references to Christianity are properly few and entirely incidental. He has attempted —and he succeeded admirably—in demonstrating that the large number of Jews in the Roman Empire at the dawn of the Christian era was due to the attractiveness of Judaism to Gentiles, fully as much as to any superlative fecundity of the genus Jew. Judaism was a missionary religion, in fact, as George Foot Moore says, it was the first missionary religion. And in spite of strict lines of demarcation—perhaps *because* of them—she welcomed proselytes whole-heartedly. When a man became a proselyte he became a Jew on equal footing with one to the manor born, save in the eyes of some jaundiced irreconcilables.

In this connection it is a joy to see Doctor Derwacter avoiding the pitfall of such terms as semi-proselytes and half proselytes. Of course no scholar today talks of " proselytes of the gate," but although that ghost has happily been laid, there is still too much talk of half proselytes as if there were stages in the initiation. Undoubtedly many Gentiles stayed on the fringe of Judaism. Attracted by the high moral tone and freedom from polytheistic crudities they frequented the synagogues. Very possibly these are the so-called God-fearers. But Doctor Derwacter is certainly right when he insists: " They are not properly proselytes; to call them demiproselytes is apt to be misleading. They are heathen . . . and . . . were regarded as outside the fellowship of the Jewish communities " (p. 37).

Again, while Judaism was a missionary religion and welcomed proselytes, it is easy to be misled by the bitterness of Matthew 23 : 15. Doctor

Derwacter interprets this, not unplausibly, as due to the contest between Jews and Christians in Antioch for converts. But it should be said—and while the author does not say it specifically, his tone of reserve throughout the volume would make it probable that he would at least partially concur—that aside from the debatable propriety of the "ye make him twofold more a son of hell than yourselves" the picture this verse gives of the nature of Jewish propaganda is out of proper focus. Judaism was ready for converts, eager for them, but evidence for the "compelling them to come in" is wanting. In the heat of the later Maccabean intoxication John Hyrcanus and his estimable son Alexander Jannæus might give their prisoners the truly Hobson's choice: Be circumcised or be killed; but this did not reflect the ordinary temper of Judaism. Rather, the door was open. Whosoever will may come.

As a matter of fact it was this reserve which accounts in no small measure for the ultimate failure of Judaism to gather her rightful harvest. "She offered to Gentiles the way that led to the favor of God; she required of them certain acts of purification and initiation. But she lacked the spirit of a mystery cult. Chiefly, she lacked a mediator, a Saviour. Moses did well, no doubt, in philosophical circles, and must have had an appeal to Greeks who held their Lycurgus in high regard. But the rank and file were not seeking for laws; they were seeking a way of redemption by vicarious suffering. The message of Judaism did not adapt itself to this demand" (p. 101). Precisely so, and accordingly Christianity which could and did adapt herself to these needs and longings gathered the harvest.

The author would not claim that his views were all new or original—although many of his emphases are most illumining. Specialists in the field of later Judaism will find most of the material familiar, but for them as well as for the more general reader the uniqueness of the book consists in its having assembled the material in extremely clear and convenient form.

The author apparently holds the heretic notion—it must be heretic, it is so uncommon—that being readable does not diminish a book's scholarly value. Notes of sources cited are abundant, and they are printed where they belong, at the bottom of the page, not relegated to a limbo at the end of the volume where they are completely worthless, and not—shades of Macaulay—in the interminable parentheses and brackets in the text itself. In short, Doctor Derwacter is to be warmly congratulated in having written an excellent book.

Morton S. Enslin.

Christ in the Gospels. Burton Scott Easton, S. T. D., Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, The General Theological Seminary, New York. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. x, 210. Price, $1.75.

It is very customary, upon reading a volume largely devoted to a review of recent literature upon some phase of investigation, to remark—if you be unfortunate enough to be a reviewer, it will be in print—in a mildly condescending way that the author has performed a valuable service for the layman. In fact, such a remark is too often the solitary word of commendation which with any degree of honesty can be spoken. Such is not the case with Doctor Easton's work. It is true of him, as of few of his colleagues, that his surveys are of equal value, if not actually of greater value, to the professional scholar. His volume, *The Gospel Before the Gospels* (Scribner, 1928—reviewed in Crozer Quarterly, April, 1928), is another splendid example of what a critical review and evaluation of an important phase of inquiry should be. It is to be hoped that other seminaries from time to time will invite Doctor Easton to give courses of lectures—for both of these volumes represent such lectureships —in order that he may have the incentive to continue rendering a service almost unique.

Doctor Easton's discussion of recent work on the mutual relationship of the first three Gospels and their sources is able and illuminating. Perhaps the most interesting element in this discussion is the part devoted to "L," that provisional source of Luke which is giving aid and succor to many puzzled interpreters of the third Gospel who do not feel themselves free to allow "Luke" to make—perhaps "make-up" would be more accurate—history but find it necessary to postulate another source for him to draw upon. In spite of the yeoman work of Streeter, Taylor, and Easton one still may cherish doubts as to the ultimate fate of this new relation of Mark and Q.

The chapter devoted to *Formgeschichte* is an able condensation of his earlier review, already noted. Perhaps the most striking contribution of these lectures is the sane and solid survey of the claims made by enthusiasts for the Mandean literature and the Old Russian version of Josephus, as sources of knowledge for a proper understanding of early Christianity.

The second half of the volume is devoted to four lectures: Jesus and the Law, Jesus and the Father, Jesus and the Kingdom, Jesus. In them he seeks to set forth positively the results of his critical studies of the Gospels. What was it that Jesus had taught and done which resulted in these chronicles? Whether one accepts the conclusion in detail or not,

he cannot fail to approve the scholarly honesty and freedom from popular prejudice which characterizes Doctor Easton's work. The volume is worthy of careful reading by scholar and layman alike.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

He Is Become My Song—Carmen Jesu Nazareni. EDITH ANNE STEWART ROBERTSON. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 275. Price, $2.25.

A LABOR of love, begun in the dreadful days of the autumn of 1916, to raise a little wayside memorial to those who in modern time had given their all even as had he nineteen centuries before. Surely this reverently beautiful epic of Jesus of Nazareth is a memorial of which none need be ashamed.

MORTON S. ENSLIN.

The Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization: Petra, Edom, and the Edomites. GEORGE LIVINGSTON ROBINSON. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. xix, 495. Price, $7.50.

THIS is a beautiful book. The publisher's art is alluring; paper, typography, illustrations arrest attention. The author's art as explorer, as descriptive writer, as interpreter of an ancient people, as portrayer of character, as revealer of secrets, is everywhere in evidence.

Esau as disclosed in the Old Testament is a fascinating character. The few paragraphs concerning him make him unforgettable. Yet he has had no great moral values for the world except as a "horrible example." It was generally assumed that Edom was buried, and deservedly so. The world was no poorer. But the explorer and the archæologist would not have it so. They had curiosity and imagination and a sense of perspective. Maybe Edom was of some consequence after all, even if an enemy's literature dispatched him with a few scattered references. And now after thirty years of labor an American scholar digs the buried Edom from his neglected grave, and we find him buried in a sarcophagus; and the descendants of the shallow and impetuous and secular Esau were an ancient civilization.

Professor Robinson has done for Edom almost what Layard did for Nineveh. If his excavations and descriptions have not excited the public to the same degree, it is because it has become accustomed to unearthing civilizations. He won attention by the discovery of the site of one of the Great High Places in Petra, the capital of the Nabateans. Since then he has for thirty years had ample opportunity by residence in Palestine, by researches in libraries, by association with learned friends, by contact with

students in lecture-room, and by leisure for reflection and writing, to produce a volume of permanent value. Every reader of the Old Testament will be repaid many fold by reading again and again this volume. The archæologist will find it rich in information; the historian will be rewarded by its description of Semitic life; the exegete will discover hints that give meaning to obscure passages; the preacher will be furnished with valuable suggestions in character study.

In eight appendices the author has given in most compact form information concerning the work of earlier explorers, his own visits to Petra, and the references of Diodorus Siculus and of Strabo to the Nabateans.

Two indexes, one of subject-matter of the book, the other of Scripture passages cited, add greatly to the volume as a tool in the library. The illustrations are superb examples of the photographer's and of the printer's art.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Creative Religious Literature: A New Literary Study of the Bible. ARTHUR J. CULLER, Ph. D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. xiii, 345. Price, $2.50.

THE author has had many years of experience as teacher of the Bible in college. This book is the result of his lecture-room method, and the adjective "new" in the subtitle is fully justified. His students studied the Biblical material by types of literature represented, namely, folk-songs, short stories, fables, parables, maxims of wisdom, oratory, essay, biography, lyric and dramatic poetry, etc. Then they compared the Biblical type with the same type in the world's best non-Biblical literature. By this method Professor Culler's pupils became explorers. They found out the superiority of the Hebrews in some forms of literature, and their inferiority in others; they discovered the freshness and spontaneity of the Biblical types; they learned to associate the Bible with other literature; they ascertained the constant recurrence in all great literature of the themes, God and providence and faith and trust and human destiny. It must have been fascinating for college students to read *Job* by an unknown Hebrew writer, and *Prometheus Bound* by Æschylus the Greek, and *Faust* by Goethe the German, and discover for themselves how the same problems persist and how each civilization grapples with them.

The first chapter deals with the literature of the Bible, and briefly calls attention to the creative spirit in art and the Bible as creative literature. The remaining sixteen chapters illustrate the theme of Chapter I by gathering the material under different types. The creative and artistic

qualities are kept in the foreground by comparison with kindred types in non-Biblical literature. It is no reflection on other chapters if Chapter XIV, entitled "The Romantic Cynic," be cited as illustration of method. A brief discussion of *Ecclesiastes* based upon most recent scholarship leads to comparison with "The Literature of Pessimism." Here the author introduced his students, and now introduces his readers to the Gilgamesh Epic; *Rubaiyat* of Omar Khayyam; *Virgin Soil* of Ivan Turgeney; *To Let*, by John Galsworthy; *Jude* and *The Dynasts*, by Thomas Hardy, and the writings of Swinburne, William Morris, James Thompson, E. R. Lytton, John A. Symonds, etc.

The Bible becomes a book of abiding interest by such comparisons; it is literature of life—and life abides. It is not strange that Professor Culler has been in great demand as lecturer on the Bible. *Creative Religious Literature* should be of interest and value to every preacher.

MILTON G. EVANS.

Mahatma Gandhi—His Own Story—An Autobiography. Edited by CHARLES F. ANDREWS. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 372. Price, $2.50.

IN the April issue, 1930, of THE CROZER QUARTERLY appeared an appreciation of *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas*, by C. F. Andrews. This same intimate friend of Gandhi's edits this volume, and in the preface gives an interesting account of the sources used in its preparation for the press. John Haynes Holmes writes a sympathetic introduction of about eighteen pages. No ordinary person could have won the intimate friendship of the editor and of the writer of the introduction; and Gandhi is one of the extraordinary men in human history. His uniqueness in contemporary history is attested by the voluminous literature he has occasioned. So unique is he, that he is a puzzling problem for the psychologist, the sociologist, the historian; and to the poet, he is the inspiration of rhapsodic odes; and to hundreds of thousands he has the mystery of a god and elicits their adoration. To some he is an ideal subject for pathological study; to others he is a menace to industrial and political progress; to others he is the true exponent of a "spiritual" religion; to others he is the ardent patriot, the ideal martyr for his people; to others the incarnation of the ideal of non-resistance as the power stronger than England's navies and armies; to all interested in the study of human personality he is alluring.

The world is indebted to Gandhi for *His Own Story*. It will be a source-book for every type of student. It discloses how deeply he is

indebted to the civilization he censures. His thinking and his social and religious ideals are the offspring of English culture and literature. Without English contacts there would have been no Gandhi such as this autobiography reveals. And without Gandhi with his acquired non-Indian ideals England would not now be confronted with the most perplexing problem of its history. To know present-day England in India, one must know Gandhi; to know Gandhi one must know English culture in India. To know both is to know all. If one wishes to know Gandhi, the flower in the crannied wall of modern India, secure *His Own Story: An Autobiography.*

MILTON G. EVANS.

Twenty-four Views of Marriage. Edited by CLARENCE A. SPAULDING. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. xix, 452. Price, $2.50.

THE Presbyterian General Assembly, in 1929, created a commission of six Ministers and five Ruling Elders "to make an exhaustive study of the subject of marriage, divorce, and subsequent remarriage, making use of the studies available and analyses of the statistics of the several States on the subject and the efforts of the Protestant churches and social service agencies to deal with it, and report its conclusions and recommendations to the General Assembly of 1930." One of the members of this commission was Rev. Clarence A. Spaulding, D. D., editor of this volume. He has made every thoughtful person a debtor by making this report available in such convenient and readable form. Twenty-four views of marriage are enough to give varying opinions, some of them repugnant to Christian feeling and thought and practise. But an honest commission has to face the facts, and deliberately both liberal and even radical views are included. Accordingly, the subject of marriage is here presented comprehensively and exhaustively. No angle of approach has been overlooked. Christian doctrine, sociological investigation, psychoanalysis, legal practise and theory, are all represented. Two paragraphs from the preface will orient the prospective readers:

> The Commission of the Presbyterian Church have no fear of presenting in such a volume ideas and points of view to which they, themselves, cannot subscribe. They believe they represent ideas that are honestly but erroneously held, and that when placed side by side with the idealism, as well as practicality of Jesus, the truth will justify and vindicate itself.
>
> Unquestionably there is abroad in this present generation a Psychology of Impermanence with reference to marriage. It has been created as a result of negative and destructive critical writings. The great need of the day is the recreation of a Psychology of Permanence and facing fairly and without flinching, not only the difficulties, but the blessings of married life.

The editor has included in his book extracts from *Ideals of Love and Marriage,* prepared by The Committee on Marriage and Home of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and extracts from the report to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Joint Commission to Study the Whole Problem of Divorce—Its Conditions and Causes.

A classified bibliography adds greatly to the value of the book.

No teacher of family and social ethics should be ignorant of the contents of *Twenty-four Views of Marriage.*

MILTON G. EVANS.

The Story of Religions in America. WILLIAM W. SWEET. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1930. Pp. 571. Price, $4.00.

A STANDARD work on the History of Christianity published a third of a century ago states in its introductory paragraph that

> The grandeur of human enterprise and achievement in the discovery of the western hemisphere has less claim on our admiration than that divine wisdom and controlling providence which, for reasons now manifest, kept the secret hidden through so many millenniums, in spite of continual chances of disclosure until the fulness of time.

Professor Sweet entitles his first chapter, "Creative Forces in American Religion," and says that "It is the purpose of this introductory chapter to point out some of the outstanding factors which have been responsible for the distinctive trends in the history of American religion. . ."

Perhaps no other words could more clearly indicate the difference between the approach made to a study of the history of Christianity a generation ago and that of today. One is supernatural; the other social. One views God in direct control of the human process, the end foreordained from the beginning; the other sees man working out his destiny under the urge of his ideals, his hopes, his aspirations, his belief in the will of God concerning himself. Religion is thus a social force, an integral part of human life which cannot be overlooked by the historian—this effort of man, whatever his varying condition and circumstance, to attain what he conceives to be his divinely ordered estate.

The Story of Religions in America is not the history of sectarianism, nor of denominationalism, nor yet of the church. It is the story of peoples in one of the most marvelous achievements of all time as they have been influenced by and in turn have influenced their religion as expressed in denominational and church orders. It is a great human drama, thrilling and captivating the race on its westward march, conquering a continent,

in so far as it has been seen by the author to have been guided by religious concerns.

With his comprehensive grasp of general American history, and his trustworthy scholarship, Professor Sweet has produced a work that for many years will serve as a text on this subject within our colleges and seminaries. The religious attitudes toward the great national problems confronting the country in the critical periods of its history, and the mutual effects produced, are accurately treated. Necessarily sketchy in sections, the story of three hundred years compressed within one volume, yet all the essential facts are set forth.

An extensive but well-chosen list of bibliography is appended, and the index is sufficient for all requirements.

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

Why I Am a Catholic. HILAIRE BELLOC, ARCHBISHOP GOODIER, S. J., FATHER R. KNOX, REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S. J., SHEILA KAYE-SMITH. **Why I Am Not a Catholic.** REV. W. ORCHARD, D. D., PRIN. J. W. OMAN, D. D., PROF. A. E. TAYLOR, D. Litt., PROF. H. L. GOUDGE, D. D., The Lord Bishop of Gloucester. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 246. Price, $2.00.

WELL, what of it? If a man is a member of the Roman Catholic Church, believes in it, finds satisfaction of soul in it, what more can be said regarding it? If a man does not believe in it, finds no peace of mind in it, does not want to be a member of it, that is his concern! Such is the first reaction of one who reads this book.

And he knows that no one is going to have his views changed by the reading of it.

However, the book does have more worth than this. The student of religion by studying these statements is given a little clearer insight into the teachings, services, values of that church for some people of today. Yet in these ten pictures given, the church is just what each writer is in heritage, culture, and training.

So then, What is Truth? What is Reality?

Moreover, when such a book is published why should not some sketch be given of the lives of the authors—the names of many of whom America has never heard?

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

The Equality of All Christians Before God—A Record of the New York Conference of the Christian Unity League, Held at St. George's Church, New York City, November 13-15, 1929. Introduction by PETER AINSLIE. New York: Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 227. Price, $2.00.

How innumerable, and how ineffectual also, are the conferences, discussions, and books concerning some form of Church or Christian Unity;

ineffectual because so lacking in originality, initiative, and independent, constructive proposals and planning. In this same issue appears another review of a little book dealing with this same subject which has value because it treats of the historical origins and developments of denominations and recognizes the laws governing the progress of human events. It sees clearly those social forces that will bring unity to pass.

But this present work, reporting the addresses delivered at the Conference, is backward looking. It discovers the true pattern in the primitive, New Testament church. Its appeal is largely to the New Testament order and to the will of Jesus—his prayer, "That they all may be one." The subject of one address is, "What would be the attitude of Jesus toward a divided church?"

Well, what would be Jesus' attitude? Who knows and can state decidedly? How could the New Testament church exist in America today? What was the New Testament church in form and organization? And which of the New Testament churches was such? What has the New Testament to offer America today in this respect? Simply nothing, directly and formally.

Altogether too much stress has been and is being laid in classroom, pulpit, and conference platform upon the significance of the New Testament as a literal guide for today. Can any one imagine these great spiritual, creative geniuses of that period, were they alive today, relying upon the New Testament for their direction? They did not so depend upon their own Scriptures! They were led by the Spirit not by a Book! They grappled with their problems, adapted and adjusted the institutions they inherited, fearlessly adopting and initiating new forms and practises that they might the more efficiently serve the most urgent physical and spiritual needs of the day. These are the men who could say, "Behold all things are become new!"

That is the value of the New Testament to us—the gift of the spirit of good-will, of faith, of creative endeavor, the conviction of an immediate stupendous task to be performed in our day and a Power sufficient unto it.

Who knows that a united church is the indispensable and desirable order for today? Perhaps what we need is "The Expulsive Power of a New Affection." When we as Christians will actually concern ourselves with remedying those social ills from which mankind suffers, racial, industrial, economic, militaristic—materialism in practise whatever our creeds—then our problem will fade. Unity shall have been achieved.

R. E. E. Harkness.

Affirmations of Christian Belief; Essays Toward Understanding Spiritual Personality. HERBERT A. YOUTZ. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 114. Price, $1.00.

USUALLY such affirmations have been discovered and founded in the trustworthy revelations of an eternal, holy, and righteous God. Doctor Youtz finds them in the very nature of human personality.

Human values are of supreme worth. Gradually mankind is coming to see this truth and to discover means by which those values may be realized, protected, and established. "The greatness of humanity is seen in its ability to bring the sense world under the interpretation of the thought world and to bring the material world under the mastery of the spiritual."

The preeminence of Jesus lies in the fact that he recognized this spiritual grandeur latent in man and appealed to it. He thus "proved himself the consummate psychologist" of the inner life. "The radical nature of Jesus' leadership is in the fact that he addressed this emerging spiritual humanity. He appealed from the actual natural selves to the potential spiritual selves able to respond to transcendent motives of self-control." Again: "The authority of Jesus' teaching lies in his utilization of the secret faiths which haunt men. The immense power of the moral motives as interpreted by him comes from his appeal to the native convictions of the heart."

How far removed is this from Calvinism and the stern introspection and self-derogation of the Puritan—and yet perhaps an outgrowth of it? But the author is not an easy-going, swivel-chair philosopher, blind or indifferent to the hard facts of the present social order. There are men today, as in all other days, who place their faith in the power-values of wealth, position, and authority. Human lives may be crushed and their worth neglected in the drive toward flaming goals.

If there are healing and constructive virtues resident in the heart of man there are also "forces that destroy; there are paths that lead to death. . . A man may miss the way"—to noble character and high moral-spiritual achievement—"by sheer blindness or heedlessness. . . Eternal life is attained only by choice and heroic effort."

Nevertheless the most encouraging fact in world experience is that the psychology of the materialist can be changed. He may be made to see that human values give worth to all other values which man may seek and possess. Increasingly, indeed, "Jesus our example is an unfailing challenge to the race." Thus he becomes mankind's own revelation and at the same time its inspiration and ideal.

This sane and inspiring little book is of six chapters: "I Believe . . . That Jesus' Spiritual Adventure Is Normative for All Mankind"; "In

Jesus' Estimate of Humanity"; "In Jesus' Estimate of the Moral Consciousness"; "In Jesus' Gospel of Spiritual Religion"; "That a Liberal Education Should Produce Spiritually Vitalized Persons." "Philosophies of Denial."

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

Community Religion and the Denominational Heritage. JOHN ROBERT HARGREAVES; ROBERT A. ASHWORTH; ALBERT W. PALMER; W. E. GARRISON; WILLIAM WARREN SWEET; WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN; HOWARD C. ROBBINS; JOHN T. MCNEILL. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1930. Pp. 150.

PROTESTANTISM has always been conscious of its many divisions. And many have been the efforts to achieve unity. Traditionally the effort has been to effect unity through a common belief, usually predicating the Bible and more especially the New Testament as the body of truth upon which all Christians might agree. Strange it was not recognized that the same New Testament had existed before Protestantism had arisen! But the time did come when it *was* realized that there never had been and never could be any common agreement as to the teaching of that New Testament.

Then in the process of seeking unity came the period of belittling the distinctive principles of Protestants. These are non-essentials, it was said. Why not unite upon the basic and fundamental truths in which we all believe and let these divisive elements be cast aside as outgrown? But it was found, in this respect, that there were many good Christians who would not consent to the indifference of these peculiar denominational beliefs and positions. For them they were very essential.

Now comes a new approach to the task. It is recognized that each denomination possesses something very much worth while, something very dear to its adherents, and something of exceeding value to contribute to Protestantism, if not to the Christian world at large. Why not therefore unite, and pool, as it were, the distinctive values and so enlarge and enrich our Christian thought and practice?

So the leaders of the present movement are saying: "Have the denominations unite, letting each keep its own principles, not because they are of no importance anyway, but because they are most vitally important and the Christian church needs all." President Palmer well states the point: as the glory and honor of the nations are to be brought into the holy city so, "in like manner, must not the glory and honor of the denominations at last be brought unto the complete body of the Christian fellowship?" Thus there may be unity, not upon common belief or coerced consent but upon freedom of belief, common loyalty, and with the richness of varied experience.

In this little book, Doctor Hargreaves writes the introduction, the six following authors write, each of the principles of his own denomination as related to the Community Religion proposal, and Professor McNeill of "The Transformation of Protestantism."

R. E. E. HARKNESS.

Mary Baker Eddy, a Life-size Portrait. LYMAN P. POWELL. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. 8vo. Pp. 364.

WHEN one finishes this biography of the founder of the Christian Science Church, he is no longer surprised that this powerful organization is doing its best to promote its circulation. It is the most skilful piece of propaganda that has ever been devised to forward that movement, though that is saying much. The joke is that the book professes not to be propaganda, but an unbiased study of a life and character. And the cream of the joke is that the author is not a Christian Scientist, but an Episcopal clergyman, of excellent standing in his Church. If he had been a professed follower of Mrs. Eddy his impartiality would have been under suspicion from the first page to the last.

The Committee on Publication and other authorities of Christian Science have placed at the author's disposal every sort of information in their possession. He has been admitted to their holy of holies, the fireproof vault in which are stored over 8,000 of Mrs. Eddy's letters and a vast quantity of other materials never before utilized. Mr. Powell does not boast overmuch when he says that he has written his book from original sources and that it has an authority no previous biography could claim. If that were all, this might be accepted as a final study of Mrs. Eddy.

The author says explicitly that the authorities of the Christian Science Church asked no pledge from him. None was needed. They understood him better than he understands himself. They saw clearly that so far from being biased against Mrs. Eddy, as other biographers had been, he was distinctly biased in her favor. They had little to fear and everything to hope as a result of his labors. The book justifies their confidence.

It is from first to last an unbroken pæan of praise. Mr. Powell is not extravagant or boisterous; he has the good taste and good sense to keep the soft pedal on most of the time, but the tune never changes. At every crucial point in her life, where others have found Mrs. Eddy untruthful or furtive or inconsistent, he is able so to manipulate the evidence as to bring forth a verdict in her favor. If the difficulty is really unsurmountable he smooths away part of the evidence and ignores the rest.

One instance will serve as a sample of scores. Those who read Mark

Twain's sketch of Mrs. Eddy will recall his unanswerable demonstration that she could not possibly be the author of *Science and Health*. Her letters and other undeniable compositions showed such bad English, such incorrect spelling, and other marks of half-literacy as to be totally irreconcilable with the admirable English style of the book. Mr. Powell has carefully translated the illiterate letters when he frequently quotes them into impeccable English, and for the rest makes incidental acknowledgment of the services of Rev. James Henry Wiggin, staff reader for the University Press, "detailed to work (punctuation, capitalization and general smoothing out as to construction of sentences)," p. 143. Though he treads as on eggs, Mr. Powell makes the truth plain here to one who can read between the lines. So in many other cases, but one fears that it requires more keen insight than most readers possess.

The same sort of uncritical treatment is seen in the handling of all stories about healing. The report of every case, no matter how it strains credulity, is taken at its face value, as if there could not be any possible question about the facts, whereas in every case the facts are exactly what is in question primarily, and secondly their interpretation when accurately ascertained. That too is assumed as unquestionable. In short, this element in the book is admirably adapted to convince the already convinced, but no others.

I hope nobody will construe what is said above as any questioning of Mr. Powell's honesty of conviction. He believes that he has written an impartial account; he has told the truth as he sees it, and as many readers will see it. But that his portrait of Mrs. Eddy is far from being a true likeness will be the conviction of many other readers.

It should be noted that the publishers have done their best by the book. It is beautifully printed and bound, and illustrated with many valuable portraits, views, and facsimiles.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

Hinduism Invades America. WENDALL THOMAS. New York: The Beacon Press. 1930. Pp. 300. Price, $3.00.

A GOOD many people will be surprised that the invasion of America by Hinduism has assumed serious enough proportions to call forth a book on the subject. They will be surprised, if they read Dr. Wendall Thomas' book, to discover the extensiveness of Hindu operations in this country. Doctor Thomas has not written as a propagandist of any sort, nor as an apologist for any theory. His book is a straightforward narrative of facts gathered after a very careful investigation. It is the more welcome because it reminds us, as Doctor Fosdick points out in a foreword,

that the influence of Christianity and Hinduism on each other is mutual. It is inescapable when peoples of two high cultures come into contact with one another, as is happening today both in India and in America, that there should be a mutual give and take. America needs to know not only about what is being given, but what is being taken.

The brief description of the essence of the Hindu faith is well done. The main portion of the book is occupied with description of the activities of two Hindu cults doing missionary work in America—the Ramakrishna Mission and the Yogoda Sat-Sangha Society. A final chapter deals in brief with several minor movements. In the case of the two major movements we have historical sketches of the way in which each cult has come to America and the manner of its development. Both of the cults got their start in this land by receiving invitations to send delegates to religious congresses. They are not supported by the people of India, and so are not missionary cults in the same sense as Christianity. Their support comes from American wealth, largely from people of money who have been dissatisfied with the Christian church, and have turned to Hinduism for a message.

Apparently Doctor Thomas has not discovered any large evidence of the invasion of Hinduism meeting with great success. That Hindu thought should influence American thought is inevitable. An interchange of cultural values is for the good of all concerned. In speaking of the Ramakrishna movement, he thinks that the influence on the movement from Western contacts is much more significant than the influence in the other direction. The large social service that is conducted by that movement in India was begun by Swami Vivekananda after his visit to America and contact with Christian movements. The Yogoda group in this country has not, in the main, felt that loyalty to the movement, which stresses psychic health, involves any conflict with their loyalty to Jesus. A large proportion of them are still professing Christians.

A. S. Woodburne.

The Doctrine of God. Albert C. Knudson. New York: The Abingdon Press. 1930. Pp. 434. Price, $3.50.

There probably never was a time when thinking folks were more interested in securing light on the idea and meaning of God than the present. Any man with a real message can be sure of a real hearing. The old authoritarian dogmatism is, as Dean Knudson recognizes, a thing of the past. The theologian of the present must persuade rather than dictate. But persuasion is no easy task in an intellectual world where scientific method has usurped the place that the older metaphysics once occupied.

s a courageous thing to undertake the defense of a theology that rests iarely on a metaphysical foundation in the present atmosphere. But octor Knudson has the courage, and brings to his task an extensive iowledge of the fields of philosophy and theology. The outcome is one of the most important of recent books dealing with the greatest theme with which the human mind has any concern.

The author tells us that this is the first of two volumes which will give a survey of the chief problems of theology. This one is divided into two almost equal parts, the first dealing with the province of theology, and the second part with the doctrine of God. The later volume, which we anticipate eagerly, will deal with the world, man, sin, and salvation through Christ.

The subject-matter of theology is religion. The author fortunately is not consistent with his own definition of its scope in which he refers us to the "intellectual content of religion." His definition also gives us the clue to his approach. Theology is a "systematic exposition and rational justification." The theologian has to deal with problems that constantly overlap the philosophy of religion. If he holds convictions about certain positions, and Doctor Knudson does, he will inevitably be faced with tasks of rational justification. The advantage with the present study is derived from the fact that the author is not content with the mere repetition of metaphysical formulas that have acquired a halo from their age. He is anxious to come to terms with the philosophical and ethical movements of the present. At the same time it is difficult to escape the conclusion that he has overstressed the rational element. This is particularly obvious in his refusal to consider the experience of the mystic as datum for theology. Apparently it is because of the emotional element in mysticism, admittedly a difficult matter for a rationalizing theologian. A great many mystics would decline to be classified as pantheistic in their tendencies, in spite of the fact that many other mystics have been pantheistic. The trouble is that religious persons will not be rationalistic, even for the sake of a theologian.

The task of the theologian is much more extensive than it was formerly conceived. He cannot complete his work by giving a systematic exposition of what the Scriptures have recorded of divine revelation. He must take account of the teachings of the Church throughout her history. When he begins to deal with his historical data he finds that there has been a good deal of give and take between the people of his own religion and other religions. "Only against the background of other religions and in relation to them can Christianity be fully understood" (p. 175). The theologian must be a careful student of both the history and the psychology

of religion. This is a note of recognition that is to be cordially welcomed. The present study is only a beginning in that direction. We still need a work on the doctrine of God which will deal more adequately with the relevant material available from the vast field of the history of religions.

Dean Knudson's conception of religion might be styled normative. The norm is theistic. It is a bit surprising to find him taking sides with those who doubt whether Hinayana Buddhism was a religion. But that was perhaps unavoidable with his normative definition. The author is of opinion that all religions, however primitive they may be, contain within themselves an implicit theism. His insistence on theism would rule out humanism from religion. Religion without God is to him a contradiction in terms. It is quite evident that he understands the background for the humanistic emphasis of our day—historical criticism, psychological analysis, the social emphasis—and therefore he frankly admits his dissatisfaction with this approach, and insists that there must be a return to the more philosophical factor in theology.

The philosophical position advanced is personalism, a position which the author defends in another work. Personal idealism or personalism is a philosophy which finds the ultimate meaning of life and the universe in personality. Man is a spiritual personality whose life is rooted and grounded in the perfect personality of God. "Human personality is a symbol rather than a mirror of the inner life of God." Knudson follows Lotze in thinking of personality in an ideal sense. God's is the perfect personality; man's is imperfect. A number of the personal idealists, recognizing the reality of both the divine and human personalities, have tended toward a pluralistic world-view with a limited God. Knudson thinks that a finite God is not a necessary accompaniment of a personalistic metaphysic. At this point he takes issue with his colleague, Professor E. S. Brightman, the latter finding a retarding element in the divine nature which God has to overcome. The only admissible sense of limitation would be self-limitation which does not infringe on his Absoluteness.

The last chapter in the book deals with the Trinity. It is exceedingly well done, being a careful analysis of the needs which were met by the formulation of the doctrine, the advantages of the doctrine, and the difficulties inherent. The author shows very plainly that it was the impression made on the early Christians by the personality of Christ, coupled with the desire to preserve monotheism, that led to the formulation of the doctrine. He is convinced that the doctrine has been the means of retaining the value in the Christian faith regarding God. But happily he is more concerned with the preservation of religious value than formal consistency or theoretical simplicity. The one truth which Trinitarianism

expresses and our author believes we most desire to preserve is the Christ-likeness of God. His trinitarianism is one which Athanasius would not have recognized, but it no doubt means more for our day.

A. S. WOODBURNE.

Miracle in History and Modern Thought or Miracle and Christian Apologetic. CHARLES JAMES WRIGHT. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1930. Pp. 430.

NOTHING is more striking than the changed attitude of the world of religious thinking in regard to miracles. Formerly miracle was regarded as "evidence" of the direct, intervening activity of God, and it was a splendid tool for the apologete. Today it is more likely to be taken as evidence of an unscientific world-view that prevailed at the time the event was supposed to happen, and the miracle itself requires an apologetic. The point of view of the volume under review is that the concept of miracle is religiously valuable, and that its value should not be allowed to disappear, though scientifically our conception of the nature of miracle may need to be revamped. It is thus a contribution toward a Christian philosophy of reality that will do justice to the religious value inherent in the miracle idea.

A collection of definitions of miracle would make an interesting array of differences in point of view. Mr. Wright gives us enough to permit us to see the divergence of views held. The orthodox view is in harmony with the old classical definitions of John Stuart Mill and David Hume. The former defined it as an event which was not preceded by any antecedent phenomenal conditions sufficient again to reproduce it; the latter called it "a violation of the laws of nature." Immanuel Kant was more guarded and gave a definition the tone of which still pervades many writers on the subject: "events brought about by causes of whose efficiency we are and must remain totally unacquainted." The trouble for such a type of definition arises when we do advance in scientific knowledge sufficiently to explain some of the causes. It would be less dogmatic to say that the causes were unknown than unknowable. Another school of thought has sought to give a definition entirely from the religious view-point, such as Schleiermacher's formula, "the religious name for an event," and Wendland's "something in which God objectively acts." The confusion of our day is illustrated by Sir Oliver Lodge's statement: "Miracles lie all around us: only they are not miraculous."

The problem of miracle is created by our changing philosophical conceptions. The conception as we inherit it is a relic of an intensely dualistic way of regarding God and Nature. That old dualism has for most Chris-

tian philosophers disappeared. They decline to hold nature and the supernatural in such sharp diremption as formerly was done. Such terms as intervention, intrusion, violation, and suspension simply cannot be used with our present knowledge of the nature of the universe. We live in a world where it is considered not only scientifically necessary but religiously obligatory to conceive of the universe as orderly. We may not understand all the phenomena that we observe, but the physical sciences are every year enlarging the boundaries of our understanding, and we refuse to think that ignorance implies disorder. The faith that inspires the scientist is that all events are explicable, in other words that the universe is rational.

For the theologian the crux of the problem is in the doctrine of God. Mr. Wright thinks that the revulsion against the concept of miracle that characterizes so many modern scholars is due to a swing of the pendulum from an emphasis on transcendence to an exaggerated emphasis on immanence. We must avoid both the Scylla of Deism and the Charybdis of pantheism. It has been one of the glories of a Christian view of God that it has tried to give due place to both the transcendence and the immanence of God. The abiding truth, the author assures us, of miracle is that the God who reveals himself in us and to us, the God who is immanent in us and in the world, is also transcendent over us and the phenomenal world. It is a denial of any materialistic hypothesis that finds the ground of the universe of scientific phenomena in itself, and an assertion that there is thought and will and love behind it all. The kernel of truth in the religious concept is the idea of revelation. It speaks to man of the activity of God. At the same time the author admits that religion will not be the loser if the term "miracle" disappears so long as the value resident in the concept is preserved. He suggests that those who desire to relinquish the term do so because they have conceived of the concept as stressing the power of God. Let it be interpreted through the love of God, and that difficulty will be lessened.

In a second part of the book the author applies his analysis of the question to the miracles of the Gospels and to the problem of Christology. He examines the suggestion that there is miracle exaggeration in the Gospel narratives, and after admitting that there may be some enhancement of the stories because of the mental attitudes of the people of the first century, he goes on to discuss the amount of enhancement. He strongly repudiates the tendency among certain critics to delete all the miraculous accounts, and insists that the Gospels would be unrecognizable and Christ also unrecognizable if that were done. The miracle stories are an integral part of the Gospels. He lays much stress on the character

of the miracles. None of them were for display. All were acts of beneficence. The healing incidents could probably many of them be explained if our knowledge of psycho-therapy were greater. The miraculous element in Jesus' acts was not that they were manifestations of power, but manifestations of love. The point comes back to the question of what is the right idea of God. Wright believes that the miracles were acts through which Jesus revealed the character of God to man.

The book under review is one of the most thorough discussions of the problem of miracle in recent years. The author is deeply interested in the rising new philosophy of theism, and at the same time anxious to preserve the religious value which he feels to be inherent in the Christian conception of the miraculous. In defending the place of miracle in present-day apologetics, one wonders whether he has not practically denuded the word of its original content. He has not dealt at all adequately with the criticism of Höffding who has shown how religion has suffered from employing a concept that involved explanation when its chief business was evaluation. No doubt Höffding neglects the fact that the Christian use has also included an evaluational element. Nevertheless he has offered a criticism that demands consideration. The question remains as to whether the retention of the term with its meaning so changed that the orthodox man would scarcely recognize it is going to be much help to Christian apologetics. Mr. Wright has brought together an amazing amount of material, historical, philosophical, theological, critical in a single volume. His bibliography at the close is exceedingly valuable. He has done a prodigious amount of work, and deserves our warm thanks.

A. S. Woodburne.

Types of Philosophy. William Ernest Hocking. New York: Scribners. 1929. Pp. 462. Price, $2.50.

There has been written during the past ten or fifteen years quite a number of introductory treatises on philosophy. These have followed in the main three methods. One is the historical. Mr. A. E. Baker's little book *How to Understand Philosophy* is simply a short and rather popular history. Will Durant's book is even a more notable example of that type. Others try to compel the student to face up to the problems. The introductions of Cunningham, Fullerton, Patrick, Watson, and Brightman employ that method. Professor Hocking introduces us very effectively to a third method, a combination of the historical and the systematic. He has selected certain world-views that occur and recur in the history of reflection. These views are described and critically examined. It is a method

which ought to prove of great value to the beginner who is at first much at sea due to the great number of schools and schools within schools that have characterized the history of philosophy. At the same time the book has real value for the systematic student who feels the need of help in organizing the data of history.

The main types with which the author deals are Naturalism, Pragmatism, Intuitionism, Dualism, Idealism, Realism, and Mysticism. In particular the metaphysics and the theory of knowledge that characterize each school are described. To some extent the author also indicates the types within the main types. For example he gives a clear account of the distinctions between subjective and objective idealism, and again between realism and neo-realism. It is rather disappointing that Professor Hocking has confined his remarks concerning Critical Realism to a footnote where he speaks of the movement as a dissent from Neo-realists, deviating in the direction of the Kantian theory of knowledge. His discussion of Pragmatism also is pretty thin, and none too discerning. The author exaggerates the subjectivistic and utilitarian aspects of pragmatism, and describes a pragmatism which probably no pragmatist would be willing to father.

One difficulty that the writer of a book dealing with philosophical types is sure to encounter arises from the fact that some men are exceedingly difficult to classify in any particular class. Their positions have affinities with two or three schools of thought, no matter how you look at them. Doctor Hocking evidently experiences that problem as we see from the fact that different portions of the work of one philosopher are used to illustrate positions characteristic of different types. The great Plato and the more modern genius Immanuel Kant were men of this sort. Plato has elements which he uses to describe intuitionism, dualism, idealism, and realism; Kant was pragmatic as well as idealistic, and had significance for both intuitionism and dualism. William James was another of the great minds that offer difficulty to the classifier, though, of course, his main affinity was with Pragmatism. The concluding section, especially the *Confessio Fidei,* makes it plain that the author himself is not one of the philosophers that can be tucked away neatly in a pigeonhole. If the attempt were made, the pigeonhole would bear the label of objective idealism, but he would be reaching around the edges toward other compartments. The idealism which insists that the world is a system of meanings he regards as a philosophic minimum. He even has inclinations toward absolutism, and is quite right in pointing out that the physical interpretation of relativity is in accordance with certain changeless principles. Probability itself must be reckoned by a calculus. On the side

of epistemology, Hocking claims to be a mystical realist. In interpreting religion he is humanistic, and humanism depends on a transfigured naturalism which is idealism.

Types of Philosophy is a valuable analysis of the outstanding methods of dealing with the problems of human reflection. It is for the most part very readable, and within the grasp of the beginner. The beginner will probably experience the greater amount of difficulty with the section on Realism, but that is doubtless due to the nature of the material, for the realists borrow a good deal from physical science which is sometimes hard for the layman to understand.

A. S. WOODBURNE.

Procession of the Gods. GAIUS GLENN ATKINS. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. 1930. Pp. xi, 577. Price, $3.00.

HERE is a book on the history of religions from one who is at once a clear thinker and a master of style. Scholarly works do not always make easy reading, but Doctor Atkins has given us a book that is a joy to read. In fifteen fascinating chapters he guides his readers through the intricate courses of religious life, as it has manifested itself in the great religions of Egypt, Babylonia, Persia, India, China, Greece, and Rome, and in Islam, Judaism, and Christianity. The preparation of the book must have involved a prodigious amount of work, and the bibliographical references confirm that impression. The bibliography at the end is exceptionally well selected.

The point of approach for his studies Doctor Atkins finds in the social history of the peoples concerned. It is a case of his practise being sounder than his theory. He tells us on page 10 that he does not accept the social origin of religion. We cannot really criticize him for his personal judgment on that matter, since in his treatment of the various religions he has so consistently related religious development, as it ought to be, to the cultural and social developments of folks. In fact the author has excelled in that very aspect of his work. He has displayed unusual penetration in finding his own way and offering guidance to his readers in picturing the psychological and sociological settings of rites and beliefs. He finds the beginnings of religion in the sense of controlling power which came from the ways of the environing world, which man interpreted in terms of what he knew best—himself. Historically he finds religion issuing finally in monotheism, pantheism, and humanism. Of these monotheism is the most significant. This is the *terminus a quo* for the procession of the gods. He does not believe that the procession will finally disappear

from the stage of human life, and man alone remain. The religion of religions is the Christ faith in a God who knows and cares. As the author aptly concludes, "The religious experience of a Galilean carpenter gave final content to faith in God."

Mention has been made of the fine literary style of the author. He has a gift for epigrammatic phrases which often serve to drive home a point. "Though an intolerant religion loses its soul, it often inherits the earth." "In other religions the human is deified, in the Greek religion the divine is humanized." At the same time Doctor Atkins cannot be said to have sacrificed accuracy to style. He has done his utmost to get at the facts in the great procession of the gods, and to record them accurately. He has produced a volume beside which such a popular work as *This Believing World* is only a primer. Probably the desire to produce a volume that would have literary worth has resulted in some addition to the length, but not enough to make the work less effective.

On a few points there will be differences of opinion. It is rather surprising to find Zoroastrianism described as "ethical monotheism," even though a qualifying clause is added a little later. It is generally acknowledged to be the typical dualism of history. There are some modern Zoroastrians, trained in the processes of modern philosophic reflection, who try to overcome the ancient dualism by a faith in the final victory of Ahura Mazda, but they are not orthodox. Again, Doctor Atkins thinks that women enjoyed a better status in Buddhism than any other Oriental religion. What about Zoroastrianism? Another point—it is surprising to find the author going against scholarly opinion that the Vedic hymns are the creation of a priestly class. Doctor Atkins apparently accepts the rather obscure interpretation of Indra as originally a sun deity; most scholars consider him a storm-god. One who has lived in India is surprised to find the temples of Benares taken as monuments of typical Hinduism. There are a few typographical errors that ought to be corrected in another edition.

None of these criticisms is directed against the fundamental merit of the book. It deserves a wide reading, and we venture to predict that many will turn its pages with real delight as well as profit. Though it is not the outcome of original research and will not greatly benefit the technical scholar, it will afford a welcome sketch for the average reader who is interested in religion. Every minister ought to read the book; and many teachers will find it serviceable for suggested readings for their classes.

A. S. Woodburne.

What Do Present-Day Christians Believe? JAMES H. SNOWDEN. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. xiii and 357. Price, $2.50.

THE present volume consists of one hundred chapters, the title of each being in the form of a question. The author tells us that the book is not intended for the scholar, but for popular consumption by young people in Christian study classes. The book is well planned to meet this aim. Each chapter contains a few select questions and topics for further discussion. It might have been useful to make some bibliographical suggestions.

Naturally the topics considered cover a wide range. They deal with practically all the questions of a religious nature which are likely to come up in classes of the type the author has in mind. If there is any conspicuous lack in the topics considered, it is on the side of Christian ethics. It is exceedingly likely that any group of young folks that come together today for serious study of Christian belief would want more guidance than this volume affords in the matter of what Christians believe to be right and wrong in a host of practical situations. Doctor Snowden would be the last man, we feel sure, to divorce religion from the problems of life, and the omission does not, we suspect, reflect a bias. It is not surprising that there should be omissions and perhaps the greater surprise should be that it is so inclusive. There is some unevenness of importance in the discussions, but that was perhaps inevitable.

Doctor Snowden's point of view might be described as liberal orthodoxy. He is idealistic in his philosophic standpoint, and open-minded in regard to the advancing world of science. He sees no reason why a man cannot be religious in the scientific world of our day. At the same time he wishes to retain the Christian faith in the miraculous, and stands by the Virgin birth and other miracles. One could wish sometimes that when he puts his discussion topic in the form of a straight question, he would be as definite in the way of answer. The form of many of the questions would lead the reader to expect definitions which do not appear. Perhaps the author had a pedagogical motive in avoiding definitions in some cases. He is a bit naive in informing his readers that we know God in the same way that we know one another. The physical universe can only be understood as the physical body of God by a liberal use of the imagination. The approach of Canon Streeter in his *Reality* is more in accord with the facts of experience.

A. S. WOODBURNE.

Christianity in a World of Science. CHARLES FORRESTER DUNHAM. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 185. Price, $2.00.

HERE is a book on the relation between science and religion for the minister. The history of the relations between Christianity and the sciences

is told in an interesting and accurate way, with due regard for the relative importance of events. The student who wants the story in more detail may go to Andrew Dickson White's monumental work, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom.* But there are many ministers who need to know the story in broad outline without the details. Mr. Dunham has met that need admirably.

Mr. Dunham begins with an account of the rise of science, and goes on to describe the Hebraic notions of science that influenced early Christianity. The world-view of the Hebrews, as is well known, was in harmony with prevailing Semitic ideas, such as were found among the Babylonians. The Hebrews did manage to reduce the amount of magic and animism with which they were surrounded. But an account of a number of the miraculous phenomena recorded in the Old Testament makes it apparent that there was a pretty thin line between the magical and the miraculous for those ancient peoples. The author presents a rather deadly list on pages 137 and 138, including the records of snakes walking on their tails, bears devouring children to order, an ax-head floating on water, an army blinded at a prophet's command, demons transferred from men to animals, and a hair-cut removing his strength from a giant. All of these Biblical stories are records of beliefs of ancients which would be impossible in the world of science in which we live today.

The story of the bitter struggles between the advancing physical sciences and the Catholic Church through the Middle Ages and down into modern times is familiar. The names of such men as Galileo, Kepler, Bruno, Da Vinci, La Place, etc., will always be remembered for the part these men played in winning the battle for freedom and truth. The battle is not over yet. The anti-evolutionists are still determined to confuse the issues and stand athwart the path to progress. Recent newspaper articles seem to indicate that Einstein is going to be treated about as cordially as Darwin by those who insist on authoritarianism.

Mr. Dunham rightly finds in the advances of the sciences an aid rather than a hindrance for the theologian. We owe to scientific method the rediscovery of the Bible as a living book with a human appeal and matchless spiritual power. The sciences are also making possible and necessary the reconstruction of theology. The world in which the sciences flourish is one in which a healthier, saner type of religion can live. Civilization needs both Christianity and science, and it needs to have them cooperating in a world of truth and progress, for the increase of human welfare.

A. S. Woodburne.

Solving Life's Every-Day Problems. James Gordon Gilkey. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Doctor Gilkey has given the public in this volume a very practical piece of reading with a very rare merit; it is absorbingly interesting. For those who are faced with the constant task of finding fresh material for addresses and sermons it will prove helpful, not only because it will furnish just such material, but better still, because it will show them how skilfully such material can be put to use.

While the topics deal with some very old-fashioned themes, nevertheless, they are dealt with in a fresh and fascinating manner. There is a wholesome vein of philosophy through the whole book, and a delightful absence of monotony.

The subjects are not primarily religious, but the treatment always is. Through the whole volume one sees the social conscience hard at work with the difficulties of life, and on the whole, rather victoriously.

George F. Finnie.

Which Gospel Shall I Preach? B. H. Bruner.

This is an unusual volume, both in its conception and in its treatment. It is not hard to believe that it grew out of disturbances created by the war experiences.

The chapters entitled "When the Preacher Looks at the World" and "When the Preacher Looks at the Church" are very searching, and are worthy of a wide reading. There will be many people who will disagree with what is said about the church school. It is a brave statement, and most preachers know it is true.

The best thing one can say of this volume is that, if carefully read with an open mind, it will stimulate not only one's interest, but also his conscience.

Not only is the book rich in personal experience and meditation, but it shows a wide field of investigation and reading. It will well repay any pastor who will take time to read it.

George F. Finnie.

Great Themes of the Christian Faith. A Collection of Sermons arranged by Charles W. Ferguson.

The preface of this book informs us that the collection is not meant to be one of "star performers." Only one of the preachers is no longer with us, namely, Doctor Jowett. So the collection is rather a cross-section of good preaching; it may not even be thought of as the best.

The contributors represent not only different schools of theological thought, but also wide differences in culture and geographic location.

To those who are interested in homiletic technique the book will come with as many different types as there are sermons in it. Both material and form will commend it to all lovers of sermon-making and sermonizing.

GEORGE F. FINNIE.

Things I Know in Religion. JOSEPH FORT NEWTON.

THIS volume is a collection of twelve sermons dealing with the themes of religion about which Doctor Newton is quite sure. His purpose is summed up in the remark that "What we need is not faith in more things, but more faith in a few profound things." There is no question about the themes being profound. Both the titles and the passages of Scripture employed assure us of that. The sheer intellectual honesty with which the subjects are treated is in perfect keeping with the profound nature of the subjects.

But there is more than a combination of intellect and profound subject-matter. There is a winsomeness of expression which carries these chapters almost entirely out of the field of prosaic writing into the realm of poetry. Essentially, Doctor Newton is a poet, both in thought and expression. He not only loves beauty, but he expresses beauty on every page.

Those who love good style in the written and spoken word will find enjoyment in the reading of this volume; and their souls will not go unblessed.

GEORGE F. FINNIE.

Individualism Old and New. JOHN DEWEY. New York: Minton, Balch and Company. 1930. Pp. 171.

AMERICA'S foremost philosopher has turned aside from highly technical scholarship to present to the lay American a description of the "crisis in culture" in which he is involved. The historic agrarian development of the Western world gave rise to a type of individualism that served very well conditions of the pre-industrial era. Because men have not changed their idealistic order of behavior in harmony with the radically new demands imposed by the new urban civilization, Americans are involved in a serious social revolt. The turmoil works within the individual as well as within society. The personality pattern of yesterday is unable to contain the spirit of today, a spirit intoxicated with the wishes and possibilities of an age of science, industry, and urban luxuries. "We

are living in a money culture, its cults and rites dominate." Quantification, mechanization, and standardization; these are the marks of the Americanization that is conquering the world. They have their good side; . . but they have invaded mind and character, and subdued the soul to their own dye."

The easiest remedy of the prophet is to repudiate the whole secular system, and to call for a return to classical orthodoxy of culture. Just here, Dewey introduces a timely corrective to many otherwise courageous souls. Nothing is to be gained by social condemnation; much is to be suffered and lost by it. The reformer cannot turn back the tide of history. But he can believe that cultural salvation is possible. The author is a meliorist. It will be forthcoming as men accept the machine age with all its threats and dangers and venture to understand it, with a view to controlling it more advisedly and transcending it for the promotion of idealistic purposes. "The problem of constructing a new individuality consonant with the objective conditions under which we live is the deepest problem of our times."

The religious worker may find two sources of wisdom in Dewey's book. The first is that he cannot stand off from the pagan influences that are blighting the inner life and expect to produce socialized Christians by independent and other-worldly preservative measures. All men, by reason of the fact that they participate in this commercial age, are being commercialized. All men are "lost" in a profoundly real sense. Churchmen, as well as the non-religious, suffer from the secularization of life. The second is that the religionist must use the raw and unhuman resources of our civilization by means of which to remake men and such institutional forces as should control them for superior ends. "A machine age is a challenge to generate new conceptions of the ideal and the spiritual . . . through and by science, nature (human as well as cosmic) may become the friend and ally of man." Dewey knows no substitute for thinking in working out the reconstruction of human values; and it must become scientific thinking. The Christian will do well to entertain his challenge favorably, even though he may desire to add to it.

STEWART G. COLE.

Personality and Science. LYNN HAROLD HOUGH. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1930. Pp. xii and 185.

MAN has made our machine civilization; man should recover his dignity and control it for high-minded ends. This is the burden of the author's message to our times. He is determined to deal a death-blow to mechanistic materialism, that has swanked so militantly for a quarter of a century

upon the stage of American thought. To this end Hough is impatient with such current literature as tends to perpetuate the dehumanizing philosophy of science. He is unmincing in his denunciation of the social view-points of such well-known critics as Joseph Wood Krutch, Bertrand Russell, and John Dewey; and strongly commendatory of the positions of A. S. Eddington, Dampier-Whetham, and Rufus M. Jones. He notes the half-way favorable claims of Paul Elmer More, Walter Lippmann and Irwin Edman. The author reveals a wide acquaintance with the contemporary literature of fiction, art, science, ethics, and philosophy, and proceeds to use their claims in a somewhat proof-text fashion to give edge to his apologetic.

It may be that the author's fleeting characterization of certain individuals scarcely does their view-points justice. Many will take exception to his remarks about Dewey's instrumentalism, viz., that he deals naively with epistemological problems in his recent book, *The Quest for Certainty*. At the same time, most religious leaders will affirm the timeliness of Hough's thesis, and find in his essays sharp arrest to any unthinking survivals of mechanistic philosophy.

STEWART G. COLE.

The Inner Sentinel. A Study of Ourselves. L. P. JACKS. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1930. Pp. v, 183.

READERS of substantial literature are indebted again to the editor of the *Hibbert Journal*. In his latest volume of twenty brief essays he treats of various themes bearing on "ourselves." Brevity in this instance is not a sign of inconsequence, nor variety evidence of scattered subject-matter. Like the classical Baconian essays, each contribution has something valuable to say about our thought age, and it is said in precise and arresting style. Agree or disagree, the reader will think. He will discover that this contemporary civilization is playing some queer tricks upon men's manner of thinking. Some students will criticize the author because he raises too many questions concerning current problems in life-philosophy, and because he has left too much unsaid on these subjects. If Doctor Jacks does not clarify every phase of the questions he introduces, he does indicate clearly the direction in which his answer lies; content with that, he leaves every man to work out his own inner salvation.

In the third essay the author introduces an interpretative principle of present-day thought (that most people are eye-minded in religion and philosophy, neglecting the ear, touch, and olfactory doors to reality), that would revolutionize the Christian practises and doctrines of the church, if taken seriously. Why should the musician have cornered the sound-

world, or certain animals the smell-world? After all, how incomplete a universe does the religious man take account of in his rationalization of faith? If religionists have been tardy in recognizing the appeal of the inclusive world without, they have been just as delinquent in failing to appreciate the *whole* man within, i. e., "the inner sentinel." In Doctor Jacks' strong desire to have men regard their fellows as an integration of body *and* mind, thinker *and* willer, reflecter *and* doer, it is possible that he overlooks certain social conditions peculiar to our age that tend to break down the harmony of self-composure and make of most individuals more or less "split" personalities. Besides, must not minding have precedence over willing in meeting some life-situations; and vice versa in self-adjustings to others? His ideal was never more fitting; but it is very difficult, if not impossible, to approximate.

The author is probably more pragmatic in his philosophy than he would be willing to grant. One cannot read certain pages of this book without recognizing the influence of William James in *The Will to Believe*. And when he evaluates thought processes, his logic is almost as instrumentalist as that of F. C. S. Schiller in his latest book, *Logic for Use*. "The logician is far from being the impartial and disinterested operator he seems to be and sometimes, in his modesty, claims to be. . ." "Truth" in any situation has much to do with the personality of the spokesman of such truth. "The meaning of my thought is inseparable from the fact that I, and no other, think it. . . My feelings, words, deeds, and thoughts are not floating derelicts in space or time, drifting at large in the universe, impersonal, homeless and unattached. They are anchored in *me*, as yours are in *you*." There is a particular mind back of all minding, and a person getting self-expression in certain gestures, symbols, argument, science, or what not; human motivation must be considered in understanding language communications. The churchman will be especially interested to read how Doctor Jacks associates logic and mysticism in essay fifteen.

STEWART G. COLE.

The Sociology of Religion: A Manual and Source Book for the Study of Religion in Its Social Aspects. Third Revised Edition. CLARENCE MARSH CASE. Western Education Service, Los Angeles. 1928. Pp. xvi, 225.

THIS mimeograph text is not on the regular book market, and for that reason is not widely known. But it deserves review recognition for two reasons: it has been produced by one of America's leading sociologists, and it represents a treatment of social science in which religion is given its rightful place. Doctor Case gathered the materials for use in one of his advanced student courses at the University of Southern California.

The term, "the sociology of religion," though suggesting the nature of novelty to most theological educators, is a type of approach to religious phenomena that is long overdue. Christianity has always been propagated by social agents and has survived by means of its social structure. Not only that, but many of the so-called "spiritual" forces that make its institutions dynamic are subject to social analysis and evaluation. Case defines the sociology of religion as "the study of the relation of religion to group life and culture, with respect to its origins, processes, and problems, and considering at every turn its relation to personality (which itself is a sociological concept), defined as an individual with status in the group and its sub-groups" (page 4). Not that the social approach to religious phenomena is the only legitimate one (there are historical and metaphysical approaches), but rather that this method of investigation provides a basis for understanding such vital questions as the relative importance of individual spontaneity and group control in the propagation of religious experience (perhaps the most significant problem in the field of study), the psychological traits of religious communities and of local parishes, rural-urban conflicts of cultures and consequent change in religious ideal, method, and purpose, and so on. The instructor reached beyond the Christian religion necessarily in his compilation of source materials. Not least in value are the critical case studies of types of churches that occupy the latter part of the volume.

Like Topsy, the source-book "just growed." That is its greatest weakness. The subjects are not well-organized nor the materials free from redundancy. Besides, important phases of contemporary change in human interests and ideals are overlooked, also their bearing upon the maladjusted church. But the point-of-view is so highly suggestive, the issues articulated are so primary in the effective propagation of religion, and the author's attitude toward religion so manifestly fair (a rather rare attribute of sociologists), that the book calls for more than passing consideration. The critical student of Christianity should take account of it. For, upon the basis of this methodology is certain to arise a new literature that progressive churchmen are feeling after at present. The impact of natural science upon religion has contributed to the latter many problems in social readjustment and rethinking; the meeting of the social sciences and religion promises to raise as serious problems, though of a somewhat different kind. A study of Case's source-book and the collateral readings to which he refers will give the reader a liberal introduction to this new phase of practical sociology. It will also help him to see churches, sects, and religions as vital "organisms," functioning according to rather clearly defined principles in given cultural settings.

STEWART G. COLE.

Fellowship Principles and Practice. By a Fellowship Group. Edited by Malcolm Spencer and H. S. Hewish. London: George Allen and Unwin. 1930. Pp. 228.

The reviewer was privileged to be a guest at "The Free Church Fellowship Conference" at High Leigh, Herts, England, last summer. For several years a group of experimentally-minded Christian leaders have been meeting annually to consult about the prominent difficulties in the way of effective churchmanship. In July their theme was "the marks of a living church." For four days nearly a hundred English men and women reflected upon and prayed about several situations that were more or less common to their home churches, and which required thorough understanding in order that pastors might lend the Kingdom more reliable leadership. Of course, they were faced with the falling off of church interest in and the increasing secularization of community life. Their most heart-searching question pertained to the enlistment of the resources of youth in genuinely Christian pursuits. To an American, it seemed strange that the questions of the economic imperatives in the unemployment situation and the moral consequences of the open saloon within the parish, and of their undoubtedly grave obstacles to religious idealism, were entirely overlooked.

Fellowship Principles and Practice represents several years of effort on the part of a group of consultants within the Fellowship to sharpen the intellectual and spiritual tools which are necessary in order that churchmen define their prophetic ministry advisedly. The workers have sought to make their findings in the full light of scientific procedure. How closely related is the interest of these men and that of Clarence Marsh Case in the *Sociology of Religion* (reviewed elsewhere in this volume) may be judged from the following statement of purpose: "What is wanted now is a number of accurately observed studies of various groupings in respect of their corporate life and character and their effect upon the individuals composing them. A study of cases of group success and group failure would then enable psychologists to state authoritatively the true principles of group life for general use, and to advise in cases of difficulty. The present study is an attempt at such a piece of descriptive work. . ."

The resulting manual is not, strictly speaking, a text-book in the sociology of religion. Rather, is it an inspirational approach to critical problems of religious leadership. Much of the evangelical flavor has been used to contribute tang to the study of the technician. The slogan, "Love God and do what you like," indicates the spirit of the study. It is a rather interesting illustration of how scientific and religious jargon may be joined to bring forth a very useful book in Christian circles. But this harmoniza-

tion effort cannot be employed without certain dangers. One of them is plain in the authors' definition of the place of a person in a given group. With their Christian desire to prepare the way for the most complete development of personality, they claim that a group " must have a purpose great enough to provide scope and stimulus for *every* aspect of the personality. . ." This, of course, is socially impossible and culturally undesirable. All groups today—not excluding religious groups—provide for the unfolding of *partial* phases of the person's individuality. It requires the whole complex of social institutions to call forth the fullest enrichment of personal life. And, as the book indicates most convincingly, it is the commanding purpose of the Christian leader to help provide for the individual and the group the most amiable conditions for reciprocal enrichment. They are complementary phases of society and indispensable to each other's good.

It is unfortunate that there is not a more free exchange of books between British and American churchmen. Scientific men do not recognize any nationalistic interest, why should religious leaders? The book under review would give Westerners a splendid introduction to the method and spirit of stout-hearted non-conformists in England.

STEWART G. COLE.

What Is Christian Education? GEORGE A. COE. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1929. Pp. xii, 300.

OF the making of books there is no end; but not of such workmanship as has gone into this volume. Many texts are set up for light reading; few are written for study purposes. *What Is Christian Education?* like every production of the author, requires disciplined thought for its mastery. The reward is not simply a sharpening of pedagogical wits, but rather a sobering appreciation of certain difficulties that face Christian leaders, and of the spiritual returns that await the service of skilful churchmen. The text is a corrective for two types of criticism that in certain circles are brought against religious educators. It demonstrates that such men as Coe entertain due regard for the imperishable values of Christianity; and it indicates that they provide promising highways along which disciples of the Nazarene may build more hopefully the city of God.

In education there are four inter-related factors: the teacher (or preacher), the pupil (or congregation), the communicative medium usually called curriculum (or gospel), and the life-situation in which teacher and pupil are in process of developing character. Christianity has been inter-

ested mainly in the first and third with consequent limited results for the Kingdom of God. The point of proper emphasis has been misplaced, and there has been no adequate test of fitness in Christian strategy. There has been shifted to Providence much responsibility that should have rested upon the human agent. The present chaotic and restless condition of the church is the best evidence that religion is not measuring its obligation adequately. Reasons are not remote from the local base. The church has rarely taken Christianity's inherent personality-principle seriously. It has stressed unduly the backward look in history, the perpetuation of conventional formularies of faith, and the transmission of ideals divorced from social practise. Instead of blaming "the times," Coe calls upon Christians to recognize their own failures and to choose more dynamic methods of ministry.

Christian education is to be judged by what it does with persons —children, youth and age—in meeting the knotty problems of economic, social, and cosmic adjustment in contemporary life. This basic postulate gives the author a point of departure for examining such diverse interests as missionary work, worship and prayer, death and immortality, the cosmos and science, the Bible and Jesus, preaching and the Sunday school, church union and patriotic loyalties, peace and war, industry and social justice, college and seminary, and for eliciting tension-points to which churchmen had better give their attention. The material is thoroughly practical while at the same time devoutly critical. The final chapter, "Education Revealing God," far from any sterile theological formula, suggests a vital discovery of "the Great Valuer of Persons" by taking seriously the moral issues that confront Christians on every hand.

He who does not desire to have his religious thinking and conduct disturbed is advised to pursue a devious course from *What Is Christian Education?* On the other hand, the courageous pilgrim seeking wider spiritual horizons will discover a place for optimism and obligation in this book.

STEWART G. COLE.

Winning Youth for Christ. PAUL JUDSON MORRIS. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1930. Pp. 123. Price, $1.25.

THE author is Director of Religious Education and Evangelism under the Baptist State Convention of Vermont. Success has crowned his efforts to win youth for Christ; he speaks out of a rich experience therefore. The book deserves a careful review which space does not here permit. Of its ten chapters three titles will suffice to give a bit of the volume's fragrant values: Knowing the Youth We Seek to Win, The Christ Appeal to

Youth, and Personal Work of Youth for Youth. A helpful, practical volume for the pastor who would win each of his young folk for Christ.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

The Adult Department of the Church School. WILLIAM P. PHILLIPS. Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

WHENEVER any movement, in industry or politics or education or religion, begins to get down to "brass tacks" in the study of its departments, or even more minute units, there is hope, for there is life. This volume, one of the best of its kind yet produced by this Sunday School Board, will greatly aid any minister who wishes a result-getting school all the way from Beginners to Adults—here is help, very wise and rich help for the Adult end.

Our one criticism, a rather serious one, is at the point of curriculum. The author says the purpose of the Adult Department is "to teach the Bible." We should like it better had he said, "to teach the Christ who emerges from the pages of the Bible." In other words, should not a curriculum be Christ-centered rather than Book-centered? Moreover, is any curriculum adequate for adults, or others for that matter, which omits study *about* the Book, about those heroes of the faith inspired by the Christ of the Book, about those saints who suffer as they stand up for the justice, righteousness, and mercy which Christ exalts, and about the duty incumbent upon every member of this Adult Department to go out into this naughty and hostile world to reproduce in himself Jesus' kind of life? What about these glaring omissions from the curriculum?

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

Story Sermons for Junior Congregations. MARY KIRKPATRICK BERG. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. 1930. Pp. 161. Price, $1.50.

At the Foot of the Rainbow. MARGARET T. APPLEGARTH. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. 1930. Pp. 269. Price, $1.50.

The Monastery by the River. STANLEY RUSSELL. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. 1930. Pp. 107. Price, $1.25.

HERE are three story-books. The first is a large collection of short stories which have grown out of work with juniors. They are well done and quite repeatable.

The second is a collection of rather long stories by a gifted story-teller.

The third and last is a beautifully told story of the daily life in an old English monastery.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

Adventures in Money Raising. Cornelius M. Steffens and Paul P. Faris. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 278. Price, $2.50.

Here is a moving human-interest story of how President Steffens of Dubuque College built his institution from nothing to one of the best-known denominational schools in the land. It is primarily the story of one man's ability and method in making friends, enlisting their interest in Dubuque, and investing some $4,000,000 of their money therein. The book will prove both a practical help and an inspiration to anyone who has before himself a similar work.

William R. McNutt.

Church and Newspaper. William Bernard Norton. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 270. Price, $2.50.

Were I a bishop over my brethren rather than a mere reviewer I should require every minister to read this book studiously. The parish minister, in whatever place he may be located, has much to do with the newspaper, mighty molder of public opinion. Well may he desire the daily press as his ally, a desire possible of realization through mutual understanding and appreciation only. *Church and Newspaper* will foster and forward such, as will no other book known to me. The author is himself a minister, writing out of an experience of more than two decades as religious editor of one of America's great daily papers, hence he speaks with rare authority and wisdom.

A church may take one of three attitudes toward the newspaper, namely, that of one unaware of the possible ally, that of one who stands aside to criticize, and finally that of one who seeks every possible way of cooperation. And this latter is the symptom of wisdom, for must not even a divine religion be called to the attention of men, that is to say, advertised?

Whoever would write religious news must distinguish always between the *interesting* and the *important,* for the one is news while the other likely is not. For instance, the most *unimportant* utterance of a public speaker may be the most *interesting,* hence the item of news value. Indeed, "Great is publicity" when it is given the wings of a wide-spread interest.

Of the twenty-two chapters a few titles will suffice to open a window to the inquiring: The Link-Style of Writing News, On Avoiding Glittering Generalities, What and Why Are Scoops, On Taking Trouble, Pictures as News, Certain Ministers as Models, How the Newspaper Helps Sermon-Making, How to Write Effective Religious Editorials, View-points of the Daily Newspaper, View-points of the Church, and Religion in a Small-Town Paper.

Yes, this book is really the bearer of good news because it will help any minister in winning the press for the enlargement of his own field of influence.

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

Sergeant York: Last of the Long Hunters. THOMAS SKEYHILL. Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company. 1930. Pp. 240. Price, $1.50.

IN this book one finds the usual excellencies and the ordinary, perhaps unavoidable, defects of a story of war life. If there is to be such a story at all it must be woven to a large degree out of soldiers' experiences. When these experiences are of such an exceptional character as those which came to Sergeant York war itself naturally takes on a certain glamor, and those who read these pages will of course think of the heroic side of militarism rather than its tragedies. Such an influence is to be regretted in every way. The excellencies of the work are to be found in the high purposes of Sergeant York, in the fact that when he returned from his battle exploits he was willing personally to leave the war as a thing of the past, and, having been impressed in the army service with the value and importance of education, he was eager to use all the chances which came to him, financially as well as otherwise, to aid those in the mountain districts in the direction of receiving the benefit of schools and that education of which Sergeant York himself felt the lack in his army service. Thus the volume is happily a stimulus in the direction of things which make for social uplift and for peace when read by those who are disposed to see these useful sides of the unique life of Sergeant York.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

The Challenge of the Forum: The Story of Ford Hall and the Open Forum Movement: A Demonstration in Adult Education. REUBEN L. LURIE; with a Foreword by GEORGE W. COLEMAN. Boston: The Gorham Press. 1930. Pp. 218.

ONE sees directly from the title of the work itself something of the meaning and significance of this volume. Mr. Coleman tells us in his Foreword that the author "has become an intimate member of the Management Group, and has turned his literary gifts to the service of the Forum," and that in addition he "has been aided in his task by a close personal familiarity with the life of the Forum," as well as having other extensive qualifications for preparing the book. With such opportunities he has written a story of Ford Hall and its activities which has long been needed for a real understanding of the unique foundation which was established by Daniel Sharp Ford by his will in 1898 and has been encouraged, guided,

and thoroughly stimulated by Mr. Coleman during the later years. The first part of the book sketches particularly the history of Ford Hall and its work. In the second part there is presented an outline of the open forum movement in general, particularly in its relation to the influence which Ford Hall and its Forum have exerted in many directions. Nothing more needs to be said to emphasize the value and utility of the book. For all who are interested in Crozer Theological Seminary, however, it should be added that the copy received for the Seminary library bears the autograph presentation of Mr. Coleman.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

Pioneering for Jesus: The Story of Henrietta Hall Shuck. THOMAS S. DUNAWAY, D. D. Nashville: Baptist Sunday School Board. 1930. Pp. 157.

THE author of this volume is a graduate of Crozer Theological Seminary in the class of 1898. Ill health which has taken him out of the active pastorate has at the same time turned his attention to the beginning of Baptist missionary service in China, and particularly to a re-study of the life of a pioneer in Christian education among the people of the great Chinese Empire. Doctor Dunaway prepared the volume in the Memorial Hospital, Richmond, Va., but, while limited to hospital life in composing the work, he took unusual care to avail himself of exceptional sources even to the extent of sending a representative to New York City to examine the archives of what is now the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society and thus make use of the unique contemporary records as well as the correspondence of Mrs. Shuck with the Society in America. Still further he had early records in other places in America examined for rare data which would make the account more complete and reliable. With such materials in hand Doctor Dunaway has written an engaging, instructive, and stimulating narrative which will be profitable and interesting reading for any one who cares to become acquainted with the earliest period of American Baptist missionary activities in the Orient.

FRANK GRANT LEWIS.

A Faith that Works. EDWARD S. WOODS, Bishop of Croydon. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. 1930. Pp. 224. Price, $2.00.

HERE is a volume packed full of practical Christian common sense. One who reads it is soon convinced that Canon Woods has not failed in carrying out his announced purpose:

> I venture to conceive myself as a sort of "middle-man," taking the work of the best thinkers in the Church, and handing it on, in a more digestible form, to some of the great mass of those who, inarticulate perhaps, and not much in the way of students, are none the less spiritually hungry.

After discussing life—the human self housed in a human body, and its setting—that it must be lived in close relationship with other human lives, the author offers as a solution for the resulting complex problems "The Way of Jesus." This because "He has shown, once and for all, what human life may be, and because he can inspire other men to live their lives on his principles." Two outstanding things in Jesus' earthly life are emphasized: "that he did himself practice, habitually and completely, the other-regarding point of view which he urged all men to adopt," and "His whole view of men, his actual relationship with the men of his time, was part and parcel of his relationship with God."

Upon this broad foundation the structure of the book is built. Chapters are devoted to the home, material possessions, and the machine age. Education is stressed as the only hope for solving the problems of the present day and making men realize their heritage as sons of God. Religious education is presented as including much more than religious instruction.

The question of world peace is dealt with frankly and courageously in two chapters, entitled "Force or Faith." In another chapter, "The Church Facing the World," race problems, industrialism, and secularism are discussed. "Christianity and Local Life" and "Keeping Sunday" are other matters presented in a fair and liberal spirit.

The concluding chapter, headed "The Sermon on the Mount in 1929," is a challenge to the reader to join the ranks of the "Christian Adventurers." Men should really try Christianity because it works. There is a brief epilogue urging that "the greatest need today in the church and in the world, is, simply, *more of God.*"

There are two appendices, one giving important resolutions bearing upon international relations, passed by various religious bodies, and the other presenting vital facts concerning the League of Nations.

Rittenhouse Neisser.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Studies in Matthew. BENJAMIN W. BACON, B. D., Litt. D. (Uxon.), Buckingham Professor (Emeritus) of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis in Yale University. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1930. Pp. xxvi, 533. Price, $4.00.

THIS very important iconoclastic contribution to synoptic criticism will be reviewed in these pages in a later issue.

Religious Aspect of the Conquest of Mexico. CHARLES S. BRADEN. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press. Price, $3.50.

The Problem of God. EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: The Abingdon Press. Price, $2.00.

Poems for Special Days and Occasions. Quotable Poems for Church Year Days. Compiled by THOMAS CURTIS CLARK. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $1.00.

The Gospel According to Luke. JOHN MARTIN CREED, B. D. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Greatest Thoughts on Immortality. Compiled by PROFESSOR J. HELDER. One hundred or more thoughts collected from correspondence, and many from articles from writings of distinguished men of all professions and all shades of opinion. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $2.00.

Beds of Pearls. REV. ROBERT G. LEE. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc.

Points for Emphasis. HIGHT C. MOORE, D. D., Litt. D. Vest-Pocket Commentary of Sunday School Lessons. 1931. Nashville, Tenn.: Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention.

Charleston Papers. Record of the Church Congress in the United States on Its Fifty-Sixth Anniversary, 1930. Introduction by the General Secretary, HAROLD ADYE PRICHARD. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $2.50.

Religious Education of Adults. W. EDWARD RAFFETY, Ph. D. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, $1.50.

Religion in a Changing World. RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $2.00.

Tarbell's Teachers' Guide. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1931. Pp. 432. Price, $2.00.

THIS edition of the well-known "Guide" seems up to par. Many are the teachers who feel they could not carry on without its help.

The Idea of God in the Philosophy of Saint Augustine. W. P. Toley. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $2.00.

A Quiet Talk With God Each Day. J. Sherman Wallace. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1930. Pp. 230.

This is the "Fourth Annual Edition" of one of the very finest vest-pocket booklets of daily thoughts for the devotional hour, the prayer-meeting, or the young peoples' society.

Behind Mud Walls. Charlotte Viall Wiser and William H. Wiser, Manipuri, India. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $1.50.

REVIEWED IN THIS NUMBER

The Equality of All Christians Before God. Report of New York Conference of the Christian Unity League. Introduction by Peter Ainslie. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $2.00.

Gandhi of India—His Own Story. Edited by Charles F. Andrews. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $2.50.

At the Foot of the Rainbow. Margaret T. Applegarth. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $1.50.

Procession of the Gods. Gaius Glenn Atkins. New York: Richard R. Smith.

Why I Am and Why I Am Not a Catholic. Hilaire Belloc and Others. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $2.00.

Story Sermons for Junior Congregations. Mary Kirkpatrick Berg. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $1.50.

This Believing World. Lewis Browne. Sixteenth Printing. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $1.00.

What Gospel Shall I Preach? B. H. Bruner. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $2.00.

The Sociology of Religion: A Manual and Source Book for the Study of Religion in Its Social Aspects. Third Revised Edition. Clarence Marsh Case. Los Angeles: Western Education Service. 1928. Pp. xvi, 225.

What Is Christian Education? George A. Coe. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1929. Pp. xii, 300.

Creative Religious Literature. Arthur J. Culler, Dean and Professor of Biblical Literature in Hiram College. New York: The Macmillan Company.

A History of Science, and Its Relations with Philosophy and Religion. William Cecil Dampier Dampier-Whetham, Fellow Trinity College, Cambridge, etc. New Edition, Revised and Corrected. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Preparing the Way for Paul. Frederick M. Derwacter. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $1.75.

Individualism Old and New. John Dewey. New York: Winton, Balch and Company. 1930. Pp. 171.

Pioneering for Jesus. Thomas S. Dunaway. Nashville, Tenn.: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Christianity in a World of Science. Chester Forrester Dunham. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $2.00.

Christ in the Gospels. Burton Scott Easton, S. T. D., Professor of Literature and Interpretation of New Testament, General Theological Seminary, New York. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, $1.75.

Great Themes of the Christian Church. Various writers arranged by Charles W. Ferguson. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $2.00.

Solving Life's Every-Day Problems. James Gordon Gilkey. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Community Religion and the Denominational Heritage. J. R. Hargreaves and Others. New York and London: Harper & Brothers.

Types of Philosophy. An Introductory Book on Philosophy. William Ernest Hocking, Alford Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pages 462. Price, $2.50.

Personality and Science. Lynn Harold Hough. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, $2.00.

The Inner Sentinel. L. P. Jacks. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, $2.00.

The Doctrine of God. Albert C. Knudson, Dean Boston School of Theology and Professor of Systematic Theology. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: The Abingdon Press.

The Challenge of the Forum; the Story of Ford Hall and the Open Forum Movement; a Demonstration in Adult Education. Reuben L. Lurie; with a Foreword by George W. Coleman. Boston: The Gorham Press. 1930. Pp. 218.

Winning Youth for Christ. Paul Judson Morris. Philadelphia: The Judson Press.

Things I Know in Religion. JOSEPH FORT NEWTON. New York: The Macmillan Company, Price, $2.00.

Church and Newspaper. WILLIAM BERNARD NORTON. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $2.50.

The Adult Department of the Sunday School. WILLIAM P. PHILLIPS. Nashville, Tenn.: Sunday School Board of Southern Baptist Convention.

Mary Baker Eddy. LYMAN P. POWELL. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $5.00.

He Is Become My Song. EDITH ANNE STEWART ROBERTSON. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $2.25.

The Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization. GEORGE L. ROBINSON. New York: The Macmillan Company.

The Monastery by the River. G. STANLEY RUSSELL, M. A. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $1.25.

The Coming Religion. NATHANIEL SCHMIDT. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Sergeant York: Last of the Long Hunters. THOMAS SKEYHILL. Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Co. 1930. Pp. 240.

What Present-Day Christians Believe. JAMES H. SNOWDEN. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $2.50.

Twenty-four Views of Marriage. From the Presbyterian General Assembly's Commission on Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage. Edited by CLARENCE A. SPAULDING. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $2.50.

Fellowship Principles and Practice. By a Fellowship Group. Edited by MALCOLM SPENCER and H. S. HEWISH. London: George Allen and Unwin. 1930. Pp. 228.

Adventures in Money Raising. CORNELIUS M. STEFFENS and PAUL P. FARIS. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $2.50.

The Story of Religions in America. WILLIAM W. SWEET. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1930. Pp. 571.

Hinduism Invades America. WENDALL THOMAS. New York: The Beacon Press. Price, $3.00.

A Faith That Works. EDWARD S. WOODS. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. Price, $2.00.

Miracle in History and Modern Thought, or Miracle and Christian Apologetic. CHARLES JAMES WRIGHT. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1930. Pp. 430.

Affirmations of Christian Belief. HERBERT A. YOUTZ. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, $1.00.